



Cornell University Library

THE GIFT OF

Thomas Frederick Crane,

Professor of the Romance Languages and Literatures.

Cornell University Library
PQ 287.D25

French romanticism and the press:



3 1924 027 180 821

olin



Cornell University
Library

The original of this book is in
the Cornell University Library.

There are no known copyright restrictions in
the United States on the use of the text.

<http://www.archive.org/details/cu31924027180821>

FRENCH ROMANTICISM
AND THE PRESS
THE GLOBE

CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS WAREHOUSE,
C. F. CLAY, MANAGER.

London: FETTER LANE, E.C.

Glasgow: 50, WELLINGTON STREET.



Leipzig: F. A. BROCKHAUS.

New York: G. P. PUTNAM'S SONS.

Bombay and Calcutta: MACMILLAN AND CO., LTD.

[*All Rights reserved.*]

FRENCH ROMANTICISM
AND THE PRESS
THE GLOBE

BY

T. R. DAVIES, M.A. (WALES),
ASSISTANT [≡]MASTER, GROCERS' COMPANY'S SCHOOL,
HACKNEY DOWNS, LONDON.

Cambridge :
at the University Press

1906
M

Cambridge:

PRINTED BY JOHN CLAY, M.A.

AT THE UNIVERSITY PRESS.

PREFACE.

THE Press has been somewhat neglected as a factor in the history of French Romanticism ; it contains a wealth of information which, if fully treated, would throw considerable light upon this important subject. The object of this work is to discuss fully the position of the *Globe*, which has suffered the fate of all the other journals. The material upon which the work is based will be found in the *Globe* ; all other sources of information are carefully noted. My best thanks are due to Mr E. A. LEWIS, Fellow of the University of Wales, for suggestive criticisms on the historical portion of the work. Finally, I have to thank Mr F. H. BROOKSBANK, Government Secondary School, Alexandria, the Rev. CECIL ROBERTS, Willesden, and my colleague, Mr S. A. RICHARDS, for kindly revising the proofs.

T. R. DAVIES.

LONDON,

September, 1906.

CONTENTS.

	PAGE
INTRODUCTION	1
CHAP. I. The History of the <i>Globe</i>	2
„ II. Its Tenets	4
„ III. The Meaning of “Romantic Tendency”	20
„ IV. Short History of the Romantic Tendency	34
„ V. The <i>Globe</i> and Poetry	42
„ VI. The <i>Globe</i> and Criticism	106
„ VII. The <i>Globe</i> and the Novel	148
„ VIII. The <i>Globe</i> and the Theatre	161
„ IX. The <i>Globe</i> and History	209
„ X. Conclusion	222

INTRODUCTION.

THE *Globe* appeared for the first time on Sept. 15th, 1824, and ceased to exist on April 20th, 1832. It was thus coexistent with what is known as *The Romantic Movement* in French literature. A journal of this kind must have wielded a great influence, and it is strange that no more attention was paid to the subject by *littérateurs* in general. With a very few exceptions, they all state that the so-called *Romantic Doctrines* were preached by the editors; it will be our endeavour, in this work, to examine this statement. Before proceeding to the discussion of the subject proper, we propose to examine the history of the *Globe* together with its tenets as found in its columns. Then we shall proceed to consider the term *Romantic Movement* in its literary and historical aspect. Finally, we propose to consider as fully as possible, and in strict chronological order, the works which are dealt with. The reader will find the date of each article, then the name of the author of the work. The articles are generally initialled, and, wherever possible, these initials will be assigned to the respective writers. Where there is neither name nor initials, the reader must conclude that the article is anonymous. In conclusion we shall consider all the evidence offered, and express a final opinion.

CHAPTER I.

THE HISTORY OF THE *GLOBE*.

THE few years preceding 1830 marked an important epoch in the history of France. The Revolution, with its far-reaching effects, was still casting its shadow on French society and literature. One of the most important phases of this influence was the gradual awakening of the youth of France to new ideas and fresh ideals. The 18th century with its cast-iron system of philosophy, and an even more enervating system of literature, still prevented the realisation of the aspirations of the age. Into the midst of this darkness Lamartine shed forth light by the production of his *Méditations*, which contained a wealth of imagination and personal feeling unknown to the old *régime*. It was the dawn of day which cast its rays into the darkest corner of France; even within the fold of the Church, whose very existence seemed bound up with the old traditions, we find a few enlightened men who felt the difficulty of their position. L'Abbé Gerbet was one of those pioneers, and he seems to have been one of those enthusiastic souls who must needs inspire others. He inspired a gentleman named M. de Salines, and the two together started forth on their campaign in the Church.

In 1824 they founded a paper, *Le Mémorial Catholique*, printed in Paris by a man named Lachevardière. The paper gave utterance to the youthful, liberal spirit of the age. At this office there was a *prote*, of the name of Leroux, a man of advanced opinions. The new paper was very successful, and it seemed to Leroux that

a like paper would command a large circulation amongst the more numerous class of people whose interest in things clerical was *nil*. He mentioned the matter to his employer, M. Lachevardière, who strongly urged him on.

He had a collaborator in M. Dubois, a thoroughly competent journalist. We find some of his writings in a periodical of the same stamp as the now defunct *Tablettes*. We find Jouffroy and Damiron joining in the management, while Trognon gives occasional help. Mérimée is an occasional contributor, and with him are Vitet and Duchâtel. Among other contributors are Rémusat, who deals with literature pure and simple, M. Duvergier de Hauranne, Magnin, Vitet, Sainte-Beuve, and Ampère. For the next five years the *Globe* was very successful as a progressive organ of a varied character. In 1828 Lachevardière withdraws his capital, and the paper becomes entirely political; but Guizot, aided by Broglie, comes forward with the money to ensure its continuance, though they take no active part in the management.

In the issue of January 23rd, 1830, there appears an article in which a retrospective view is taken of the five preceding years. Very soon after, the paper is bought up by Michel Chevalier, Carnot and Barrault, but there is no appreciable change in the literary views. Towards the beginning of 1831, the stirring events which were taking place in Paris naturally changed the appearance of the paper, and the editors were forced to devote more space to these events, so that literary criticisms are few and far between.

The *Globe* is then taken over by the *Société Saint-Simonienne*, and its main object now is the propagation of its doctrines. The new policy of the paper is set forth in the issue of January 18th, 1831, and articles dealing with literary criticisms become rarer than ever. The paper appeared for the last time on April 20th, 1832.

CHAPTER II.

ITS TENETS.

BEFORE proceeding to a discussion of the position of the *Globe*, it is advisable to quote in full the article setting forth its policy which is to be found in the first issue of the paper.

“ Depuis dix ans, au milieu des agitations politiques, et malgré le dédain dont elle semblait être l'objet, la littérature a prospéré en France. Des poètes nouveaux ont apparu, pleins de verve et de jeunesse ; des essais quelquefois heureux ont avancé la réforme du théâtre ; un système de philosophie religieuse a fait école ; et de grands et sérieux travaux ont ramené l'histoire à son véritable but.

“ Cependant la critique littéraire a dépéri de jour en jour, et l'on aurait peine à citer une feuille où elle s'exerce à la fois avec indépendance et vérité. Les journaux politiques ont été obligés de la bannir ; les graves sujets de leurs discussions et les vives inquiétudes de l'attaque ou de la défense, ne leur permettent pas de s'y livrer. Si quelquefois ils s'occupent de littérature, c'est pour eux un intérêt de parti ; l'homme ou l'ouvrage leur appartient, ils le jugent avec leur préoccupation, et dès lors rien ne s'écrit dans l'intérêt de l'art ou de la justice. Depuis longtemps le public a senti ce défaut, et depuis longtemps aussi des journaux littéraires ont été établis ; mais ceux-là encore n'ont été que de véritables journaux politiques déguisés ; tous se sont

modelés sur un journal qui eût quelque vogue en 1814 par ses mordantes allusions, ses satires amères, et sa redoutable connaissance des hommes politiques. *Le Miroir*, sa première copie, en a produit mille autres ; mais, à mesure que des mains des hommes qui avaient été mêlés aux affaires d'état ou aux secrets de l'empire, la plume a passé entre les mains de simples lettrés ou de jeunes novices, l'épigramme commune, le quolibet ont remplacé les piquantes révélations ; et cependant on s'obstine en cette littérature à peine digne de la vieillesse du 18^{ième} siècle. Paris, à en juger par les journaux, n'est qu'un grand salon de 1798, où l'on s'inquiète d'un acteur ou d'une actrice, d'un bon mot. Que si l'on prétend à des croquis de mœurs, à l'esquisse fugitive de nos travers, cela est bien ; et il se peut que beaucoup se complaisent à ces légers essais, mais est-ce là de la critique littéraire ? N'y a-t-il dans les esprits un autre besoin ? Ces générations élevées depuis la restauration et tourmentées du désir de s'instruire, trouvent-elles là ce qui peut occuper leur pensée ? On a souvent reproché à la jeunesse sa hâtive impatience de se mêler aux débats politiques. Peut-être, entre beaucoup de causes, n'est-ce pas une des moins puissantes que de n'avoir présenté à son activité d'esprit aucun objet de méditation sérieuse et de saines études ; il lui fallait une occupation digne d'elle ; une seule s'est offerte, est-ce sa faute ?

“ D'autre part, toutes ces feuilles semblent voir le monde et la France dans Paris ; aucune n'a été conçue dans un autre intérêt que celui de la capitale. Les comptes-rendus des pièces de théâtre, les critiques sur le jeu des acteurs, voilà ce qui les remplit. Je ne sais si les lecteurs des départements y trouvent grand plaisir, mais à coup sûr, ils ne sont pas juges de la justesse de la critique ou de la vérité de la satire : aussi est-il à croire que bien peu de ces journaux vont au delà des murs.

“ Ce sont là des défauts qui viennent des passions du

temps et de fausses vues ; quelque indulgence leur peut être accordée. Mais il est un vice qui déshonore, et qu'il faut bien signaler, au risque de se faire des inimitiés. La critique est devenue une spéculation d'auteurs et une commerce de librairie. Chaque coterie a sa feuille ; sous le voile de l'anonyme, chacun y loue son livre, ou le fait louer par un secrétaire ou un disciple. Le public qui n'est pas dans le secret, croit à l'éloge où quelquefois la main paternelle, par surcroît de finesse et de ruse de calcul, veut bien jeter ça et là une censure de bienveillance qui le relève et fasse valoir, comme on dit. Le plus souvent, l'argent à la main, et l'article rédigé par un faiseur de sa maison, le libraire commande à dix feuilles à la fois. Chaque matin, la France est étourdie de certains noms qui doivent rappeler la gloire des beaux siècles ; et cependant de grandes compositions, des travaux de conscience et d'utilité publique obtiennent à grand'peine l'annonce de politesse pour les deux exemplaires ; le jeune homme modeste et inconnu est repoussé dans l'obscurité qui désespère ou bien, l'on l'enrôle, et il se perd en prenant livrée. Ainsi la justice littéraire est à l'encan, et il faudrait désespérer de la critique, si, par bonheur, la raison et le goût n'étaient au-dessus des atteintes de quelques traitants ; car enfin tant d'esprits élevés, tant de nobles caractères, qui coopèrent la rédaction des journaux, ne peuvent être leurs complices, il y aurait trop de douleur et trop de honte pour les lettres.

“Le temps est venu pour une réforme qui doit, tout à la fois, retirer la critique du commerce et des passions politiques, ramener la justice avec l'indépendance, et satisfaire à cette sérieuse curiosité de l'utile qui travaille tous les esprits. En entrant dans la carrière, tel est le but que nous proposons. Il n'y a ni vanité ni prétention à l'avouer ; c'est tout simplement conviction et conviction sincère d'un besoin que nous entendons exprimer partout autour de nous.

“Les peuples sont aujourd'hui unis par les intérêts ;

la civilisation entretient entre eux un utile échange de connaissances comme de produits ; avec les nuances qui les distinguent, tous marchent, à l'ombre de la paix, vers un but commun. Rien de ce qui se fait chez l'un est étranger à l'autre ; il y trouve exemple et profit. C'est donc une grande utilité que de propager dans un pays la connaissance de tous les autres ; et cette connaissance ne saurait mieux s'établir que par celle des diverses littératures ; car la littérature des nations, c'est leur vie. Donner toutes les nouvelles étrangères littéraires, voilà ce qui remplacera chez nous le compte-rendu des théâtres et les esquisses parisiennes. En second lieu, non seulement la France a besoin de connaître les autres peuples, mais elle s'ignore elle-même ; de Paris, on nous dit tout ; mais l'état de la littérature et des arts dans les provinces, les travaux des sociétés savantes, les efforts d'industrie qui en tient compte jour par jour, et nous en dénonce ou les progrès ou la langueur.

“Cependant que peut-il y avoir de plus utile comme de plus curieux que de révéler à chaque contrée sa force ou sa faiblesse ? A côté des mœurs parisiennes, véritable expression d'un passé qui s'efface, corriger les unes par les autres, n'est-ce pas préparer une lecture aussi variée que profitable, et distraire plus agréablement que par un bon mot ? Enfin examiner sérieusement et en conscience toutes les productions littéraires vraiment utiles et remarquables ; s'occuper du théâtre quand le théâtre produira quelque nouveauté originale, ou grave ou légère ; quand quelque acteur de talent paraîtra pour la première fois sur la scène, ou s'essaiera dans un genre nouveau, mais laisser à l'oubli toutes ces pièces qui se succèdent, sans aucun bénéfice pour l'art ; en un mot, constater le succès, et en montrer les raisons, voilà notre but.

“Après cette exposition de notre plan, trop vague peut-être, mais que la généralité, dans laquelle nous sommes obligés de nous renfermer, ne permet pas de préciser davantage, il nous reste à parler de nos doctrines

littéraires. Deux mots suffisent : *liberté et respect du goût national*. Ni nous n'applaudirons à ces écoles de germanisme et d'anglicisme qui menacent jusque à la langue de Racine et de Voltaire ; ni nous ne nous soumettons aux anathèmes académiques d'une école vieillie qui n'oppose à l'audace qu'une admiration épuisée, invoque sans cesse les gloires du passé pour cacher la misère du présent, et ne conçoit que la timide observation de ce qu'ont fait les grands maîtres, oubliant que les grands maîtres ne sont ainsi appelés que parce qu'ils ont été créateurs. Le devoir de la critique, à juger du moins par ce qu'elle a été de tous les temps, n'est pas d'interdire, mais de provoquer les essais ; car ce sont les essais heureux qui lui donnent ses règles ; elle ne fait jamais loi qu'après coup. Laissons donc tenter toutes les expériences et ne craignons de devenir Anglais ni Germains. Il y a dans notre ciel, dans notre organisation délicate et flexible, dans notre goût si juste et si vrai, assez de vertu pour nous maintenir ce que nous sommes. Notre entreprise est vaste ; il faut du temps, des soins ; en commençant nous serons faibles ; mais si réellement le public éprouve le besoin d'un journal tel que nous concevons le nôtre, il accordera quelque indulgence à notre effort ; nous espérons y répondre par le progrès et l'amélioration. Nous ne lui citons ni noms ni autorités qui nous appuient ; l'utilité, la vérité, le temps—voilà nos éléments de succès. Cependant si des études spéciales donnent le droit de parler, chacun de nos rédacteurs peut se l'attribuer sur l'objet de ses travaux. Tous, d'ailleurs, nous cherchons la vérité de bonne foi ; si nos formes ont quelque chose de dogmatique, c'est l'habitude de conviction ; mais nous n'avons ni intolérance ni préventions obstinées ; qu'on nous éclaire ; notre feuille est une tribune que nous ouvrons de bon cœur ; toute opinion contraire à la nôtre, comme aussi nous appelons la coopération de tous les hommes, amis de leur pays, des bonnes études et des beaux arts. Sur la censure ; comme en tout autre temps, libres

parce que nous respecterons toujours les lois, même celles qui pourraient nous déplaire, parce que d'ailleurs les objets de nos recherches sont étrangers à la politique, nous n'avons à redouter d'autre censeur que le public ; puisse-t-il n'être pas trop sévère."

This is a straightforward statement of policy, and it is thoroughgoing, if we consider that nearly all the literary productions of the period were but empty forms of the past, lifeless, and devoid of ideas which would appeal to the opinions of the age. The first idea of M. Leroux was to make the *Globe* useful by recording events which occurred abroad, publishing translations of foreign authors ; in fact, to be a stop-gap until something better appeared. "La première idée, la conception du *Globe*, lorsqu'il fut fondé, il y a près de sept ans (et lui qui parle ici, est plus compétent que personne pour décider ce point), consistait à recueillir et à présenter au public français tous les travaux scientifiques de quelque importance." (P. Leroux, in the *Globe*, Jan. 18th, 1831.)

M. Dubois, with the approval of M. Leroux, thought that the paper, if it was to succeed, must have a definite policy. "Mais cette pensée, toute de curiosité, de patience, d'impartialité, se trouva bientôt ne pas suffire à l'application. Dans ce grand travail et de recherche et de critique, le besoin de règle et de plan se faisait sentir. Il fallait un centre de doctrine, auquel on put ramener ces investigations ; la liberté le donna."

(*Le Globe*, Jan. 18th, 1831.)

Though M. Leroux assented to this policy, yet we see that his ideas, with regard to the utility of the paper, were carried out. This is to be seen from the translations of foreign classics, and the scientific news. These details go far to shew that the *Globe* was not to be on the level of an ordinary periodical, for the editors felt that they had a mission into which it is now our duty to enquire.

The opening words of the introductory article give a faithful description of the state of the literary world

in France. We have Lamartine, in his *Méditations*, making a new departure in the realm of poetry ; Thiers, Thierry, Guizot, Michelet, Mignet discover the scientific study of history ; Lamennais heralds the dawn in the Church ; B. Constant breaks through the fetters of the 18th century system of philosophy, and Villemain introduces striking innovations even in the icy halls of the University.

However, as in all upheavals, the old order of things has its adherents, some actuated by honourable motives, others mourning the loss of their means of sustenance ; and the result is a sharp conflict between the two factions. The true aim of literature is lost sight of in the struggle, and the *Globe* was justified in deploring the absence of real criticism. Healthy criticism had, in the past, been beneficial, and it was as likely to prove so in the future. The *Globe* shews that, in most cases, the critics upheld their own party without sufficient reason, and abused, to the utmost of their power, the opposing party.

All criticism seems to have been in the hands of purely political newspapers, and when this proved unsatisfactory, the *soi-disant* literary papers appear, but they were worse than their predecessors, since they found means of introducing politics through their literary criticisms. The founders of the *Globe* brought out their paper to meet this long-felt want, and, needless to say, it was welcomed by the saner portion of the community. The previous publications of this sort had confined their attention to Paris only, but the *Globe* makes an exception in this, for we have therein interesting news from the provinces. Neither does it confine its attention to France alone. It pleads for better relations with other countries by interchange of opinions. Just one or two examples will serve to shew the absolute blindness of mere partisans, both new and old alike, to the real merits of the authors concerned. One fervent classic, Lemercier, favours us with the following estimate

of that great Romantic poet, Victor Hugo — "Avec impunité, les Hugo font des vers." Again Baour-Lormian in his *Canon d'Alarme* favours us with the following lines :

"Il semble que l'excès de leur stupide rage
A métamorphosé leurs traits et leur langage ;
Il semble, à les ouïr grognant sur mon chemin,
Qu'ils ont vu de Circé la baguette en ma main."

This trait is by no means confined to the adherents of the old school, for many of the young people, brimming over with the exuberance of youth, express extreme opinions. "Vive la Nature, *brute et sauvage*, qui revit si bien dans les vers de M. de Vigny et V. Hugo." (Thiessé in *le Mercure*.)

For the first few years of its existence the *Globe* steered clear of politics, and criticised without fear of any party. Even its most damaging articles were written in a polished style, and the editors never descended to personalities. They were men who had sound judgment on literary questions, and not mere dabblers. We have instances to shew that they never criticised with personal bias, and their own friends often receive severe criticisms. "Ce triomphe est bien, selon nous, un peu de faveur ; mais il y a aussi de la justice, et nous aimons à rendre ce témoignage, peut-être n'est-il pas sans quelque poids, car personne n'est allé avec plus de prévention que moi à cette représentation." (M. Dubois, on the *Germanicus* of Arnault, No. 46, 1824.) Again, "Il y a grande part à faire à l'admiration et à la censure dans les Orientales." (*Le Globe*, Jan. 21st, 1829.) The editors even hint at some authors who got friends to pass favourable criticisms on their works.

The above extracts will suffice to shew the impartiality of the *Globe* towards both schools ; Arnault being true to the past, while Hugo embodied in himself the aspirations of the young poets. Turning to Paris, we see bargains being struck between author and publisher, the result being an artificial public opinion. They aimed

high, and well could they, having already gained some experience in the now defunct *Tablettes*; their aim was "examiner sérieusement et en conscience toutes les productions vraiment utiles et remarquables"; they were only going to pay attention to really valuable productions, and the worthless works of the Pseudo-Classicists were wholly ignored, except in so far as they affected the natural development of literature. They were of the same opinion as V. Hugo, "L'art ne compte pas sur la médiocrité" (*La Préface de Cromwell*). They were not going to uphold new ideas merely because they were new. Reason was to be their guide—"montrer la raison").

Our interest may be further aroused if we enumerate the different groups on the staff of the *Globe*; MM. Jouffroy and Dubois had been banished from the University for being too advanced in their opinions. The serious men of the "Salons" were represented by Rémusat, and then came the quick-witted southerner, Thiers. Then again the steady Guizot and the unsettled Sainte-Beuve come in to intensify the differences. This apparent vacillation on the part of the *Globe* has given rise to many unfavourable impressions. "Les idées, développées dans le *Globe*, manquaient de base fixe et de forte limite; elles révélaient des esprits animés d'un beau mouvement, mais qui ne marchaient pas vers un but unique ni certain." (Hatin, *Histoire de la Presse en France*, Vol. VIII, p. 500.)

The ideas are, however, original and independent, because they emanate from minds untrammelled by any prejudices or outside influences. Though there were so many different elements, yet these met on the ground of fair criticism which constituted the one link which joined them together. A. de Nettement (*Histoire de la litt. fran. sous la Restauration*) calls the *Globe* "une coalition d'amours-propres"—a statement which is hardly applicable in this connection, as *l'amour-propre* is not generally fostered in the company of so many different

ideas—a company where each member was attempting to uphold one common ideal. The phrase seems to suggest a literary coterie, but the *Globe* was far removed from this.

The *Globe* kept up its high standard for many years, and its independence was so strong that many people who did not hold its views on certain questions of literature and philosophy, had a high regard for it. The *Globe* was a power in the literary world, but with the fall of the minister Villèle, the press becomes free, and the *Globe* becomes somewhat of a political paper. Thus its influence was somewhat minimised, and more so, considering its past high estate. This was regrettable, as it meant the weakening of the forces of independent criticism when the literary struggle was at its height; but the change was due to the political proclivities of the age, so that, after all, the change was only natural.

Thiers, who had contributed the articles on painting, to the *Globe*, seemed to regret the change. Writing to Guizot, he says—"Que dites-vous du *Globe* depuis qu'il a changé de forme? Je ne sais pourquoi, je suis contrarié d'y trouver toutes ces petites nouvelles et cette polémique de tous les jours. On se recueillait autrefois pour le lire, et maintenant cela n'est pas plus possible; l'attention est distraite et partagée. C'est bien le même esprit, ce sont les mêmes articles; mais il est désagréable de trouver, à côté, des choses qui sont partout." What answer do we expect from Guizot but complete sympathy with the regrets of his friend, Thiers? "Il a raison, le *Globe* perdit beaucoup à devenir un journal politique comme tant d'autres."

The *Globe* goes on in this way until the issue of Jan. 23rd, 1830, when the editors take a retrospective view of their work; there is no doubt that it will be interesting to hear their views.

"Alors (the first appearance of the *Globe*), les opinions en littérature et en philosophie n'avaient aucun inter-

prêtre. A peine formées encore, chancelantes et, pour ainsi dire, à l'état d'instinct plutôt que de croyance, elles s'épanchaient ça et là dans les conversations ; elles transparaient dans quelques pages rares ; elles se hasardaient dans quelques essais d'art dont la réputation se propageait comme par imitation sous le silence des journaux ou sous leurs moqueries. En politique, nous sortions des agitations convulsives des sociétés secrètes. Désarmée par la raison plutôt que par la crainte d'un gouvernement au fond sans force et sans dignité, la jeunesse française revenait à l'étude paisible de ses institutions, se comptait, regardait l'avenir et, sûre que son temps viendrait, inhabile encore à se faire écouter, n'ambitionnait guère de parler sur les affaires publiques. De vieilles et utiles tribunes suffisaient à la défense des principes qu'elle serait un jour appelée à développer. Elle se prit avec ardeur aux sérieux travaux de la science, de l'histoire, de l'art. Ardents du même âge et des mêmes passions, mieux préparés peut-être par quelques études solitaires, audacieux de notre obscurité même, sans autorité, nous osâmes prendre la parole ; et nous la prîmes, il faut en convenir, avec toute l'apréte et toute la présomption de notre âge, mais aussi avec l'accent de la conviction. Revendiquer d'abord la liberté littéraire, nous acharner contre les préjugés nationaux, adorer les chefs-d'œuvre étrangers à l'égal de nos immortelles gloires, ce fut notre première mission. Assez longtemps impopulaires, nous ne nous sauvâmes de l'oppression qu'exerçaient alors sur la pensée, les vieilles doctrines et la littérature impériale que par un mépris égal au mépris qu'elles affectaient pour toutes les nouveautés. On nous aurait taxés volontiers d'aristocratie. Mais comme chez nous ce n'était ni fol amour de la nouveauté ni inquiétude d'esprits blasés qui nous poussait à la réforme, comme c'était conséquence du principe de liberté, posé par la révolution, on nous démêla bientôt."

In the first few lines of the above article we are

given to understand that the new opinions had no means of being disseminated; that they came to light but rarely, and when they did, they were passed over in silence, or sneered at by the representative journals. The *Globe* did away with this by giving prominence to all really good works; but the editors do not mention that these works belonged to a particular school of thought, and while reading the particular issue of the *Globe*, this strikes one as being a predominant feature. Further on, we are told that politics were a secondary consideration at first, and that literature had most of their attention. This is true to some extent, but the preponderance of politics comes in earlier perhaps than the editors cared to acknowledge. In the following words—"prendre la parole.....avec toute l'apréhension et toute la présomption de notre âge," the editors are hardly fair to themselves, for the one outstanding feature of the *Globe* is that the articles are fair, and written in a style free from all bitterness. The word "présomption" seems a little out of place, as they contradict themselves; for they say that they are "mieux préparés peut-être par quelques études solitaires," and if we look through the list of contributors, we see that every branch of literature is represented by men who became, at a later date, pillars of thought in France; for example, Thiers, Guizot.

Some time later than this the *Globe* was transferred to *la Religion St Simonienne*, whose organ it became. In the issue of Jan. 18th, 1831, we find a *Profession de Foi*, in which a retrospective view is taken of the past, and the possibilities of the future are discussed. The writer (M. Leroux) simply repeats the position of the *Globe*, as set forth in the previous manifesto. The future policy is also outlined, but we leave M. Leroux himself to speak of the impending change.

"Aujourd'hui que le *Globe* est placé plus qu'il ne l'a jamais été depuis la Révolution de Juillet sur un terrain solide et nettement dessiné; aujourd'hui le *Globe* est le

journal de la doctrine St Simonienne. La première idée, la conception du *Globe*, lorsqu'il fut fondé, il y a près de sept ans (et lui qui parle ici, est plus compétent que personne pour décider ce point), consistait à recueillir et à présenter au public français tous les travaux scientifiques de quelque importance. Mais cette pensée, toute de curiosité, de patience, d'impartialité, se trouva bientôt ne pas suffire à l'application. Dans ce grand travail et de recherche et de critique, le besoin de règle et de plan se faisait sentir. Il fallait un centre de doctrine, auquel on put ramener ces investigations ; la liberté le donna. Le principe de liberté, professé en toute franchise, poussé à toutes ses conséquences, telle fut la doctrine générale du *Globe*. Si l'on se reporte au temps où il arbora ce principe, si l'on se souvient des inconséquences étroites et puériles des libéraux les plus francs, on comprendra que la marche du *Globe* fut à la fois une nouveauté très originale et un progrès très réel. Il aida puissamment à la chute des préjugés, des barrières qui existent encore sur le terrain du libéralisme. Il était mu dans ce travail de démolition, non plus par haine et par colère, comme les autres feuilles libérales, mais par une sympathie généreuse pour une ère d'avenir, qu'il entrevoyait confusément, et dont il voulait hâter la venue. Destructeur et pacifique tout ensemble ; s'affranchissant des liens étroits d'une nationalité égoïste, il admirait l'Angleterre.

"Alors pourtant le *Globe* eut son unité, et cette unité, pleine d'incidents, de saillies, de sentiments probes, de pensées utiles, fut non plus une idée générale un peu vague et confuse dans sa réalité lointaine, mais un homme de premier mouvement, d'une intelligence ouverte ; c'est assez désigner M. Dubois. L'unité pratique du *Globe* parut résider en lui ; nul ne porta plus constamment, et ne soutint plus haut dans la lutte, le drapeau de liberté. Mais c'était un tour de force, un équilibre, de jour en jour, plus insatiable ; l'association qu'un principe purement négatif unissait, se relâchait à chaque instant davantage. Mais la dissolution du *Globe*

n'en résultait pas nécessairement ; l'idée première, la conception fondamentale dont le développement avait dévié en se resserrant dans la politique de la restauration.

"Ce n'était plus, comme il y a sept ans, par des investigations historiques que l'œuvre d'association devait être servie ; on en était dorénavant à la pratique et à l'action. Ce n'était plus dans une fermentation lente et obscure qu'on pouvait couvrir au fond de sa pensée un rêve d'organisation à venir ; on en était déjà à sentir le besoin de préciser les doctrines et à prévoir le moment de les appliquer." (M. Leroux, in the *Globe*, Jan. 18th, 1831.)

As M. Leroux was the founder of the *Globe*, this article gives us an insight into the inner workings, and the opinions expressed are those which underlay all the cross-currents of thought. Fair, unbiassed criticism was the desire of its founder—"mais cette pensée toute de curiosité, de patience, d'impartialité." Leroux now deplores the absence of plan, but a plan was laid down at the start—*liberté et respect du goût national* ; and this rule was rigidly observed until the Revolution of July changed matters. It seems to us, however, that he deplores the change of circumstances, the pressing need of a fixed political policy, and not the absence of a literary policy, as literature was now a secondary consideration. It is advisable to lay great stress on this phrase, "Il était mu dans le travail non plus par haine et par colère," as another proof of the absence of bitterness in the minds of the contributors. Different they were in many respects ; nevertheless, the *Globe* has, as M. Leroux put it, "son unité, pleine d'incidents."

Times were certainly changed, and it was difficult, nay almost impossible, for any high-minded man not to take a keen interest in the stirring events of his country. The change in the *Globe* was, perhaps, inevitable, but we have nothing to do with this matter at present. All we can say is that, by paying more attention to politics, it

could not do as much for literature. Its articles were consequently fewer, and below the high standard of preceding articles. The paper is absolutely devoted to the propagation of the doctrines of the new religion; and so now, even less attention is paid to literature. The paper is in new hands, and there are still a few articles bearing upon literature. Everything is subsidiary to *la doctrine St Simonienne*, and perhaps new canons of literary criticism prevail. As there are a few articles written after the change in the *Globe*, it will be convenient to see on what lines the new editors proceed so that we may judge for ourselves.

“La littérature anglaise—c’est une littérature riche qui vous prend par les yeux plus que par le cœur. La littérature allemande se présente par la simple beauté de la pensée. La littérature française semble prendre pied au milieu de ces deux pour les relier à elle et entre elles; chez elle, le sentiment parle; c’est l’élan; c’est l’inspiration qui n’attend ni que la forme vienne la parer, ni la raison la logiquer; je dis avant tout ce qui fait ressortir la littérature française, et ce qui la distingue des autres—c’est le sentiment—la littérature de l’encens de la prière. Sa voix est plus pure, plus simple; sa douleur a plus de larmes; le visage plus mélancoliquement triste; comme aussi sa joie a plus de naïveté, le sourire plus franc. Maintenant que la société va s’écrouler, la poésie française qui sent plus vivement et avec plus de vérité, etc. Aussi maintenant quelle est-elle sinon une plainte continuelle, un *De Profundis* balbutié aux oreilles d’un mourant? A la scène, dans les livres, elle prédit partout l’agonie du siècle. La littérature française donne l’initiative; elle semble appelée à régénérer la littérature européenne. Toute d’élan, il faut qu’elle sorte de l’état où elle se complaît depuis si longtemps. Je propose donc à tous les poètes de réfléchir à ce que pourrait amener de grand et de sublime l’association de tous les artistes français dans le but de régénérer l’art. On ne resterait plus confiné avec

ses quelques partisans dans telle ou telle idée sous la forme ou sur le fonds, mais on chercherait à s'inspirer l'un de l'autre. Que les poètes s'associent et la poésie française sera la poésie-mère." (M. Joncières, in the *Globe*, April 19th, 1832.)

This manifesto shewed a high ideal ; a rather difficult matter amidst the stirring events which were convulsing France from end to end. The author sets out from a comparison of English and German literatures, and places French literature between the two. The *Globe* is, even now, true to one of its former principles, namely that of international intercourse on literary matters.

Sentiment, inspiration, emotion are the chief considerations ; the form is sure to follow if we have these qualities. The poet sings of the troubles of the time ; it is "le mal du siècle" of a Childe Harold, a Werther, a René. If this conception be true, then France can take the initiative, and shew the way to her less enlightened neighbours, as it was she who heralded the dawn of freedom in that ever-memorable year, 1789. The party-spirit is still absent as far as literature is concerned, so we have a second feature which has not changed ; for if that spirit were present, the wish for cooperation would hardly be expressed, and the article closes with an attack upon narrow, parochial ideas. The main outlines of the policy remain—a splendid testimony to the pertinacity of its founders, and to the utility of the principles themselves. What poetry, however, was to come up to these demands ? It suffices to say that the authors are themselves conscious of the fact, and they content themselves with judging the works from the standpoint of their new religion, though they pay some attention to the purely literary side of the questions. Thus the *Globe* drifted somewhat from its original position as a purely literary organ, and let it suffice to say that it did not live long under the new régime.

CHAPTER III.

THE MEANING OF "ROMANTIC TENDENCY."

WE now proceed to consider the meaning of the term "Romantic Tendency." We have chosen this term because it will be our endeavour to prove that it was a tendency pure and simple, in which different persons took part. There are different phases in it; each individual seems to have followed his own bent, while still having something in common with his peers; we cannot apply the word "system" to it, just as we can apply it to "materialism" for instance.

M. Delécluze in the *Journal des Débats* (1828) remarks, "on ne sait pas encore ce qu'on entend à présent par romantique"; such is the difficulty of everyone, but we have endless attempts at definition, and the truth must lie somewhere between these different attempts.

As the admissibility of a word is decided by reference to standard authors, it would be as well to quote an example of the use of the word. J. J. Rousseau in his *Rêveries*, 5^{ième} promenade, says, "les rives du lac de Bienne sont plus sauvages et plus romantiques que le lac de Genève." In this passage the word has the meaning of "romanesque," and M. Delécluze, speaking of the same word, says, "Mot emprunté à la langue anglaise où il veut dire, *sauvage, inculte, romanesque*, etc."

Rousseau used the word "romantique" in speaking of Nature, and one of the results of this was that he saw in Nature some living power which was in consonance

with his soul ; there was something behind this quality of "romanesque" ; it was individuality. The term can be applied to the works of Bernardin de St Pierre, who was nothing but *romantique* (in the sense of "romanesque"), without the individuality. What else does Senancour, himself a writer of the same type, as seen from *Obermann*, mean, when he says, "c'est dans les sens que la Nature a placé la plus forte expression du caractère romantique" ? We can then, with some degree of confidence, give to the word the meaning of "romanesque" ; but words of this sort, as indeed all other words, hardly ever have a stationary meaning.

Such being the case, we now proceed to distinguish the different meanings. We shall quote the opinions of representative *littérateurs* and then give our own views. "Être romantique, c'est chanter son pays, ses affections, ses mœurs et son Dieu" (Guttinger). This definition is just, because these different themes arise from the individuality of the man ("le Moi") ; they are themes which pertain to what is inmost in man. The authors who form part of this tendency are, in the first place, more inclined to French subjects, because they are French ; but they are not oblivious to those of other countries ; this tendency is to be seen in the history of other countries, and so, to a certain extent, can be called cosmopolitan.

"Les romantiques avaient cru que l'art était surtout dans le laid" (Michelet). This is hardly correct ; though there may have been some excesses in this direction, yet the rule generally followed in the case of *le drame* was to give place to the grotesque as well as to the beautiful, because, as Hugo puts it, we meet with both elements in actual life. The statement is too positive.

"Le développement de l'esprit qui s'élève ainsi jusqu'à lui-même, qui trouve en lui ce qu'il cherchait auparavant dans le monde sensible, en un mot qui se sent et qui se sait dans cette harmonie intime avec lui-même, constitue le principe fondamental de l'art roman-

22 *The meaning of "Romantic Tendency"*

tique" (Hegel, *Esthétique*). We have here a philosophical statement of the individuality which was so prevalent at the time. This is a statement in the abstract; but history records that the men of that age, satiated with the stirring events, and tired of the materialistic tendencies, discovered that there was something nobler in themselves, and this gave rise to the contemplation of self which can be called *individuality*, or better still "le moi."

"Sous la triple influence de la Révolution française, des littératures du Nord, et de la philosophie allemande. De cette coïncidence ou de cette rencontre, est né le Romantisme, phénomène social autant que littéraire" (Brunetière, *Évolution de la poésie lyrique*, Vol. I, p. 169). It will suffice to state here that the French Revolution had swept away every authority, even in literature; for new ideas, unknown to the authors of the 18th century, had come in. As an example of the influence of the North, we can quote the name of Ossian. The undercurrent of dissatisfaction with the things of this world, that feeling of nausea, so common among the poets, forms part of this influence. As regards German philosophy, it was Hegel who gave us a philosophical definition of the word; it was the idealism of Kant, suited to French needs by Cousin, that had a hold upon men. It was W. Schlegel who gave us the course on literature, in which the modern period is first treated in any manner approaching the scientific, and Goethe gave us Werther—the one outstanding feature of *le mal du siècle*. Brunetière is careful to use the words "coïncidence" and "phénomène" to shew that it was a "tendency" and not a "school." These influences are from the outside and only subsidiary, for the main stream of the tendency flows, as we shall shew later, from Rousseau, and is purely French.

"La liberté dans l'Art" (Hugo). This phrase means liberty, but not at the expense of art. True Romanticism means this, but not liberty which would descend to

licence. The poet wanted liberty to follow his own bent, to bring out his own individuality which is so prominent a feature of the tendency. This opinion is further supported by G. Sand who says, "la doctrine avouée du Romantisme fut la liberté dans l'Art."

"La vérité dans l'Art" (Hugo). In his *Préface de Cromwell* he says, "l'art, outre sa partie idéale, a une partie terrestre et positive." We have here a plea entered for naturalness; the poet must know Nature as Rousseau did, but he must not be trivial and commonplace, for the garb in which one's thoughts are clothed must be taken care of; if not, the ideas themselves suffer. The poet must study Nature, and gain an insight into matters as they really are; he must not aim at extreme realism because, after all, there must be a leaven of imagination. Some authors carried this principle too far, in that they falsified events in order to enhance the value of "le grotesque."

"Regarde en toi-même et connais-toi" (Byron). It is interesting to obtain the opinion of one outside France like Byron. His influence extended over the whole of Europe, and it was particularly strong in France. Byron is the incarnation of the fashionable restlessness of mind, and, as a recompense for the unsettled state of society, he urged men to know themselves—yet another example of *le Moi*.

"Songe au passé" (Scott). The same reasons induced Scott to turn his attention elsewhere, but he seeks comfort in the past. Men were already fond of the past; he does not hanker after the old forms, but tries to find a soothing influence therein. He brings his modern spirit to bear upon the past, and brings it before us as a reality. His work is a further proof of that longing for something real, and is nothing but another form of strong individuality. His work is artistic, and he created a new literary "genre"—the Historical Novel. The individuality of Scott and other modern authors is well described by Hugo. "Le sentiment de l'art im-

plique un sentiment vif et intime des choses. Tandis que la majorité des hommes s'en tient aux surfaces et aux apparences, l'artiste, comme s'il était doué d'un sens à part, s'occupe paisiblement à sentir sous ce monde apparent, l'autre monde tout intérieur qu'ignorent la plupart."

"Le Romantisme est l'alliance de la comédie et de la tragédie, ou de quelque genre d'ouvrage qu'il s'agisse, le mélange du bouffon et du sérieux" (De Musset, *Lettres de Dupuis et de Cotonet*, I). De Musset here simply repeats the views of Hugo, expressed in his *Préface de Cromwell*. The Romantic Tendency did not treat the sublime by itself, but followed Nature, where we meet with both the sublime and its opposite; and, since the stage is supposed to represent human life, we have the tragical and the comical united as in everyday life. This principle was in many cases carried to excess, but this excess was really outside the purview of the Romantic Tendency.

"Mon ami, je crois que voilà notre affaire; le romantisme est la poésie allemande; Madame de Staël est la première qui nous ait fait connaître cette littérature, et nous y ajoutâmes les Anglais" (De Musset, *ibidem*). This is incorrect, as the Tendency was of purely French origin; and all we can say is that it was helped on by ~~these~~ three phenomena. The German Romanticism had nothing to break away from; it was a return to the past history of the country, while in France, people were forsaking the past. England, on the other hand, had also its influence; neither was it a determining factor. German literature commenced with criticism, and then went on to form its models; but the corresponding French literature owed its inception to a revolt against the past.

"La poésie lyrique s'exprime au nom de l'auteur même; ce n'est pas dans un personnage qu'il se transporte; c'est en lui-même qu'il trouve les divers mouvements dont il est animé." (Madame de Staël, *De l'Alle-*

magne, II, Chap. x.) What is "la poésie lyrique"? The expression of the individual; poetry would not be lyric unless it represented the poet himself. We must extend our definition by saying that the poet must express the aspirations of the age in his own particular way; if he does not do this, his muse will not be understood, and so will become useless. This view is supported by Ste. Beuve, who, speaking of J. B. Rousseau, says, "le poète lyrique, c'est une âme à nu qui passe, et chante au milieu du monde et selon les temps, les souffles divers et les divers tons où elle est montée; cette âme peut rendre bien des espèces de sons."

"Par l'imitation de Rousseau, il s'est introduit et comme insinué dans le Romantisme, je ne sais quoi de douteux, d'inquiétant, de malsain." (Brunetière, *Origines du lyrisme*, p. 55.) Men now began to look into their own souls, and, seeing their inward poverty, they began to despair. The uncertainty of everything, the rampant materialism and indifference, coupled with the prevailing uneasiness, gave them vague aspirations. These were healthy signs up to a certain point, but, when they were carried to excess, they became nauseous, and crippled the active use of the faculties. This vagueness is inseparable from the age, and must be considered as pertaining to the Tendency.

"L'essence du Romantisme, c'est la poésie." (E. Deschamps, in *la Muse Française*.) E. Deschamps was the moving spirit of the "Muse Française," so we must refer back to see what he means by "poetry." Clever versification, "enjambement" in profusion, sensationalism, fanciful, flowery language, without any great depth of thought; such was the poetry of the "Cénacle." We must not feel surprised that they chose poetry, for it was there that the imagination had full play. On the stage, however, they failed because of their lack of knowledge of the world, and of psychological insight. This form of the Tendency is now discredited and, when these authors had calmed down their exuberance, it is then that we

can follow them. Sadder and wiser, they become more intensified in feeling, and give us more of their own inward feelings.

"La littérature est la seule qui soit susceptible encore d'être perfectionnée, parce qu'ayant ses racines dans notre propre sol, elle est la seule qui puisse croître et se vivifier de nouveau ; elle exprime notre religion ; elle rappelle notre histoire ; elle se sert de nos impressions personnelles pour nous émouvoir." (Madame de Staël, *De l'Allemagne*.) This movement was purely national ; it expresses the state of French society at the time. Here again we meet with that individual expression and, even on this score, it would not be truly individualistic, if it were wholly moulded under foreign influences. It goes back to the past, but simply to find new sources of life, not to follow out the old traditions. The Tendency was intimately bound up with religion and especially with Christianity, as a religion which laid great emphasis on the individuality of man ; the feelings once more come back to their proper sphere. Madame de Staël does not mention the form in which these thoughts were to be put. We find that great stress is laid upon this ; though the innovations were strange, yet they were, in the main, truly artistic.

"En ayant avisé un qui portait une barbe romantique, il le trouva si drôle qu'il le mit dans sa poche." (De Musset, *Revue Fantastique*, IX.) Here the word is used in the sense of *bizarre*, and so came to be used of anything strange or uncommon. The word was extended to all literary productions which did not follow the prevailing fashion. Any innovation or novelty was thus qualified, and the word was used in rather a depreciatory sense.

"L'on doit considérer le drame romantique comme un grand tableau où sont représentés non seulement des figures dans des attitudes variées et formant des groupes divers, mais encore les objets qui environnent les personnages, et même les échappées de vue lointaines, et où

l'ensemble paraît enveloppé d'un clair-obscur magique qui en détermine l'effet. La Nature et l'art, la poésie et la prose, le souvenir et le pressentiment, les idées abstraites et les sensations vives, ce qui est divin et ce qui est terrestre, la vie et la mort, se confondent de la manière la plus intime dans le genre romantique. On présente dans le drame romantique le spectacle varié de tout ce que la vie humaine rassemble, et, tandis que le poète a l'air de ne nous offrir qu'une réunion accidentelle, il satisfait les désirs inaperçus de l'imagination, et nous plonge dans une disposition contemplative par le sentiment de l'harmonie merveilleuse qui résulte, pour son imitation comme pour la vie elle-même, d'un mélange en apparence bizarre, mais au quel s'attache un sens profond ; et il prête, pour ainsi dire, une âme aux différents aspects de la nature." (W. Schlegel, *Cours de littérature dramatique*, Vol. II, Chap. 13.) This extract is a just appreciation of the qualities of the Tendency, but the only objection that one can offer is that he regards those qualities as belonging to a well-defined literary *genre*. These different qualities were, no doubt, in existence, but no one author possessed them all ; we can go further, and say that hardly any two authors possessed one of them in exactly the same degree. The Tendency is purely individualistic, and it is not likely that all would take the same view of matters. The Romantic Drama was splendid poetry, but it was a failure because it lacked acquaintance with real life ; the whole movement tended towards idealism. The Tendency is imaginative, and may satisfy the needs of the individual ; this is due to the artistic effect, and it fails simply because it has no psychological insight. The Romantic Drama lays claim to interpret Nature, but how different was this Nature from the real one ! The word " Romanticism," in this sense, seems to denote " affected naturalness."

" Il faut, pour concevoir la vraie grandeur de la poésie, errer par la rêverie dans les régions éthérées,

oublier le bruit de la terre, en écoutant l'harmonie céleste, et considérer l'univers entier comme un symbole de l'âme" (Staël, *De l'Allemagne*, p. 150). We acknowledge that this was to a large extent true in fact, and that this is one of the reasons why there are many passages which are difficult to understand; at the same time, the true aim of the Tendency was to express feelings which arose from real events—feelings which would appeal to others. It would be mere egoism for a poet to express ideas which no one but himself understood, and he could not possibly have any following. We find that, from the philosophical point of view, Hegel supports this contention, "les passions de l'âme et les affections du cœur, ne sont matière de pensée poétique que dans ce qu'elles ont de général, de solide et d'éternel." The works that come under this head express the aspirations of men generally, but moulded after the author's individual taste. The present could hardly satisfy these longings, so there is a return to the past, as exemplified by Hugo and Scott.

"On m'accuse d'avoir des goûts inconstants, de ne pouvoir jouir longtemps de la même chimère, d'être la proie d'une imagination qui se hâte d'arriver au fond de ses plaisirs comme si elle était accablée de leur durée; on m'accuse de passer toujours le but que je puis atteindre. Hélas! je cherche un bien inconnu dont l'instinct me poursuit. Est-ce ma faute, si je trouve partout des bornes, si ce qui est fini n'a pas pour moi aucune valeur?" (René).

"Ce fut, pour ainsi dire, au milieu des débris de nos temples que je publiai le *Génie du Christianisme*, pour rappeler dans ces temples les pompes du culte et les serviteurs des autels. On avait alors, après les événements de la Révolution, un besoin de foi, une avidité de consolations religieuses qui venaient de la privation même de ces consolations depuis de longues années" (*Le Génie du Christianisme*). "Le Christianisme favorise le génie, épure le goût, développe les passions vertueuses,

donne de la vigueur à la pensée, offre des formes nobles à l'écrivain et des moules parfaits à l'artiste" (*Le même*). Chateaubriand cannot be said to belong to the Tendency in its maturity, but he is a link in the chain. In the first paragraph he tries to explain the unsettled state of mind which becomes so prominent at a later date; in fact, it was he who first brought it into prominence. A natural sequel to this was the attention paid to the individuality or *le Moi*, which he intensified. Chateaubriand was the first to link Christianity with the Tendency, and, in this particular, he was followed by Hugo and others. We must, however, remember that Chateaubriand, like Hugo, was a firm upholder of the Catholic and Royalist faith, and this can be traced to the passion for the Middle Ages—a time when these two faiths went hand in hand. He regards Christianity as one of the reasons for the progress made in the realm of letters. Perhaps, after all, this was due to his political bias, for Royalty would naturally go hand in hand with Catholicism; but, whether he was sincere or not, this phase had such an influence on the Tendency that we are bound to note it.

Lamartine has a very apt description of his own poetry in his *Réponse à Némésis*:

"Non ! Non ! Je l'ai conduite au fond des solitudes
Comme un amant jaloux d'une chaste beauté ;
J'ai gardé ses beaux pieds des atteintes trop rudes
Dont la terre eût blessé leur tendre nudité ;
J'ai couronné son front d'étoiles immortelles,
J'ai parfumé mon cœur pour lui faire un séjour,
Et je n'ai rien laissé s'abriter sous ses ailes
Que la prière et que l'amour."

Why should he seek solitude if he did not see therein a living power to speak to him? Nature was his foster-mother, and it needed a strong individuality to commune with her. Love and Prayer also point to this need for lonely converse which seems to be so prevalent. These lines are those of a man who soars far above the turmoil

of the world, yet another example of *le Moi*. This feature at times could not be understood by others, because the contemplation was so intensely personal.

French literature had always followed the models of antiquity: and, though the 18th century had lost the spirit, yet it kept to the form so that it was, at best, very artificial. The meaning of the word *Classique* is aptly described by M. Delécluze as, "mot latin d'origine qui signifia citoyen de première classe. On l'a appliqué aux auteurs de premier rang et enfin à tous les auteurs de l'antiquité." The 17th century authors caught their inspiration. Rousseau revolted from this later development, and the antithesis is then between the "Romantic Tendency" and the later development of the "Classical Tendency." We must bear in mind that the true Classical works were not questioned, and, in order to make it quite clear, we shall call these latter-day Classicists the "Pseudo-Classicists." The innovators themselves had high regard for the Classical authors, and confessed that they were excellent in their time; but they were entirely opposed to their being taken as models in modern times, as they had nothing in common with the age.

M. Delécluze describes this phenomenon as follows: "Depuis quelques années en France, on désigne par le mot classique, tout peintre sans imagination qui fait profession d'imiter machinalement les ouvrages de la statuaire antique ou ceux des maîtres du 16^{ième} siècle." Though these words are applied, in the first instance, to painting, we can very well apply them to literature.

Malherbe is the founder of the Classical Tradition; it was Boileau who brought these ideas into a concise form. It flourished in the 17th century, but it fell upon evil days during the 18th. At the time of the Empire, people had not finished with the ideas of the Revolution, and they felt the need of new inspirations to meet with the new state of affairs: and the only works put forward to meet this need were those of Delille and his school.

Literature was entirely based upon the past, and, as such, could not possibly apply to the needs of the day. They restricted Nature, and took *le beau* as their type. An event, an action, was the centre of their literature, and tragedy described manners to produce action; their first consideration was form. Classical literature lent itself to imitation because of its perfection; it was abstract, and so prone to uniformity. There was an exact and logical method in all its branches; there were distinct *genres*, and not one encroached upon the other; each *genre* had its own rules which were kept, in spite of different themes and different temperaments. The author was limited, by the laws of good taste, to the choice of subjects. On the stage there had to be unity of time, place, and action: their versification was exact, and therefore rather monotonous.

On perusing the works of the young poets, one is struck by the frequency of the behest to have done with the past, and the attitude taken up is the direct contrary of the position of the "Pseudo-Classical Tendency." It is not very satisfactory to state that one view is directly opposed to another; we feel that it is too indefinite. [The preface to *Cromwell* gives a *résumé* of the movement; it would be superfluous to quote it here.]

It is a difficult matter to fix on a single definition ✓ which will take in every phase of the Tendency. The one outstanding feature is the individuality of the authors, and, if we carry this statement to its logical conclusion, we must state that every author is like himself and like no one else. One common characteristic is that they have nothing to do with a literature which is not in sympathy with the aspirations of the times; thus they break away from the Pseudo-Classical tradition. The poets begin to sing of themselves, of their feelings, their country, and even other countries, but, when they go outside their own, there is no wholesale plagiarism; they still retain their distinctive nationality, while feeling the influence of the new ideas

which were pervading the whole of Europe. There are differences between the Romantic Tendency in the various countries, but the principles which underlie are the same. These principles are treated in a different manner, and have, to a large extent, different origins, so that the Tendency in France can be regarded as purely French. There are to be no fixed literary *genres*; the author chooses his own subject, and treats it just as he likes. On the stage the action was not limited to a certain time and place, but it rested on the basis of unity—a principle which was extended to all works. They took their subjects from Nature, so that we shall meet with characters of every description, with their inconsistencies, thus leaving the beaten path and instituting a new *genre*—the *drame*—where the beautiful and the grotesque meet on equal terms.

There was more liberty of versification in the shape of *enjambement* and *césure*. Their language was flowery, but, on the stage, there was not much psychological insight, because of ignorance of the ways of the world; after all, one is carried away by the action and the poetry. Strong individuality gave rise to the constant contemplation of self (*le Moi*), a fact which originated from the upheaval of society consequent upon the Revolution. Others were not satisfied with looking unto themselves, they must needs turn to Nature for words of comfort; others harked back to the past, whence arose the passion for the Middle Ages which culminated in the Historical Novel. In some cases the individuality resulted in mere brooding over oneself, so that an unhealthy element was introduced, though not so prevalent as some people make it out to be; as a result of this, anything extraordinary was called "romantic"; but, generally speaking, Romanticism was consonant with a healthy interest in the world's affairs. Nature was, for some, the expression of the Deity; others, such as Chateaubriand, found refuge in Christianity, and regarded it as the cause of this change. Imitation

formed no part of the Tendency, even when imitation involved the copying of modern authors.

The Tendency was not characterised by any great depth of thought, as most attention was given to form. There is no mistaking the fact that the Tendency was purely native, for it started with Rousseau, and was intensified by the events of the day: it was the expression of the revival of the French nation after the stormy period of the Revolution. Excesses there may have been, but they were mere side-issues; the attention paid to foreign authors was due to a broader ideal; the authors copied what was good, but they remained French for all that.

"Redoutons l'anglomanie
Elle a déjà gâté tout.
N'allons point en Germanie
Chercher des règles de goût."

These are the main features of the Tendency, but, as we have laid special stress on the individuality, it is clear that we cannot lay down these features as rules which were followed out by all Romanticists. These are the most prominent features; most authors treated them differently. At first, the young authors banded themselves together to destroy the "Pseudo-Classical" edifice, but, when it became necessary to rebuild the fabric, there was not the same agreement; "*les protestants s'unissent pour abattre, et se séparent quand il s'agit d'édifier, de même les Romantiques.*" When considering the forerunners of the Tendency, we have only been able to distinguish some broad principles which take the form of isolated phenomena; so then, before and after a certain point, we have met with the same thing (a Tendency); for this reason, we call it the "Romantic Tendency."

CHAPTER IV.

SHORT HISTORY OF THE ROMANTIC TENDENCY.

(Up to the last issue of the *Globe*.)

THE general trend of French literature had been to follow classical models, but now Rousseau contemplated Nature after a new fashion, and found in her something which seemed to re-echo his sentiments. Rousseau was contemporary with the 18th century—a period of French literature when authors were slowly but surely drifting away from the splendid models of the 17th century, which were based on the works of the classical writers.

Things were now changing; the democracy was beginning to manifest itself; in a word, there were aspirations which could not be satisfied by imitation of the past. These authors, however, neglected this, and kept to the beaten paths. These Pseudo-Classicists flourished under the Empire, and utterly impoverished French literature.

Rousseau lived in the midst of an irreligious, callous society where no real individuality existed. He gives us *le sentiment de la Nature*. This brings him to his own troubles, and, in this connection, he introduced in his *Confessions* “le Moi,” which plays such a large part in the Tendency. Everything that has to do with the inner, as compared with the outer circumstances of man, now occupies his attention; he sings of the sanctity of human affections and family ties. He treats the questions which concern man most, his life, his future; and, in *La Nouvelle Héloïse*, we catch a glimpse of that vagueness

so dear to later writers, where he describes Julie and St Preux at Meillerie. Rousseau was very sensitive, and to this sensitiveness, which could not bear the philosophical tendencies of the 18th century, we are indebted for the insatiable melancholy which becomes so prominent among the later poets.

After him comes Bernardin de St Pierre, who was an exquisite painter of Nature. His descriptions were far from being correct; his scientific ideas were still more inaccurate. Whereas Rousseau introduced the idea of Nature, it is in the works of Bernardin that we first meet with the true inward meaning of Nature, free from any philosophical prejudices. He was an artist *par excellence*. Nature does not form the background of the picture, but the picture itself, as can be seen from *Paul et Virginie*.

The Romantic Tendency was now fairly under way, and even on the stage, the most conservative of all, we find the ideas of freedom shewing themselves. In *Le Barbier de Séville* and *Le Mariage* of Beaumarchais, some slight attention is paid to local colouring. Diderot breaks down the barriers which exist between the different branches of art. People were tired of the elegant society of the time, and we find a man like Condorcet attempting to satisfy his aspirations in the realm of reason. But this was not wholly satisfactory, and people began to fall back upon the deeper feelings of mankind. It was, however, difficult to break away from a tradition which seemed to be an essential part of the French character. Society was against this new Tendency, and that bugbear of freedom—*le bon goût*—still held sway. Even the language itself had got into a rut which it was difficult to leave. We cannot wonder then that the new Tendency seems to have died away for a time. Soon after this, we see a movement towards Greek art and archeology which finds its consummation in the works of A. Chénier; he, however, did not form part of the Tendency.

The influence of the French Revolution on literature

was enormous. It meant breaking away from the past, doing away with all social distinctions ; in fact, it meant recasting the whole fabric of society. If a literature is really to be a living power, it must be the just expression of the state and aspirations of that society. We remarked, a little previous to this, that the general trend of French literature owed its existence to the state of French society. Now this society had been swept away, so to follow the argument to its logical conclusion, the literature had been swept away. So it was in reality, but some authors resuscitated its remains and, as it were, galvanized it into life ; but, as can easily be seen, the said literature was out of harmony with the existing condition of affairs, and was but a vain echo of an irrevocable past.

Without describing the events which led up to the establishment of the Empire, we shall proceed to consider the state of literature during this period. People were so occupied with the stirring events of the day that they had not much time to devote to literature, but they paid some attention thereto, if the works were of a light nature, and not calculated to engross their attention. This desire is met by the works of Delille, which can only be called puerile. The Tendency, whose history we are now tracing, was only lying dormant ; but it was not conducive to the interests of a despot like Napoleon to have a poet of independent ideas, so it was almost stifled by the weight of the imperial power. Ducis, a well-meaning poet, with some aspirations to originality, tried to go his own way, but the perusal of his representations of Shakespeare will give one a fair idea of the barriers which independence had then to overcome.

Now we come to Madame de Staël, who, in spite of being at first thoroughly imbued with the 18th century ideas, soon left them, and contributed largely to the advance of this new Tendency. In her wonderful production, *De l'Allemagne*, she brought to the notice of her compatriots the history of German literature. "All France was too much engrossed in her own affairs, and

perhaps too conscious of her superiority, to take any notice of this great phenomenon. Madame de Staël at last interested her compatriots, and, as this German movement was purely spontaneous and a just expression of the state of society in Germany, it was a living influence, and so conducive to the advancement of the Tendency. She is a follower of Rousseau, but is superior to him in being able to paint the characteristics of people and things. She gives us a new canon of literature—quite consonant with the aspirations of the new society; she leaves her old beliefs, and embraces Christianity.

In 1768 appears another link in the chain—Chateaubriand. He is a strange character, insatiably vague, and imaginative. Some events turn his thoughts towards religion, and we find that this is a dominant note in his character, shewing forth in greater relief the anxiety he felt concerning his destiny. In 1802 he published *Le Génie du Christianisme*, in which he extols Christianity as a force in literature, as opposed to the paganism of the old system. In all his good qualities, he has only intensified and enlarged the innovations of Rousseau; so he has contributed largely to the realisation of the Tendency.

This Tendency is not confined to literature alone; it has even reached the Church, where Lamennais, by reason of his imagination and descriptive powers, has helped on the new movement. Lacordaire, another Churchman, appears to be characterised by the prevalent vagueness, and to sympathise with the strong individual feeling of the age.

V. Cousin, in the realm of philosophy, although at first purely eclectic, yet towards 1830 became quite democratic, and embraced the mysticism of Rousseau. It was he who moulded the idealism of Kant to suit French needs.

The French Revolution influenced the whole of Europe, and intensified the aspirations which had, for a

long time, been lying dormant, and only needed an opportunity of breaking out. We also notice a great upheaval in the literatures of other countries, due to the general feeling of restlessness which seemed to pervade the whole of Europe. We have no need to go into details, but it may be as well to mention some of the most important names. In England, as far back as 1726, Thomson in his *Seasons*, Goldsmith in his *Traveller*, described Nature; then came Cowper, Crabbe; then in the same vein, but to a greater degree, the Tendency was shewn in the works of Wordsworth, Southey, and Coleridge (the Lake Poets). Byron, who was satiated with society, exhibited *le mal du siècle*, and Scott harked back to the Middle Ages for materials for the Historical Novel. In the works of the so-called Ossian, we meet again with that delightful vagueness. Dante had, in the far distant past, raised the banner of revolt, and, in more modern times, the *Count of Carmagnola* of Manzoni (1820) continued that revolt. Calderon was the personification of the Tendency in Spain; but, at that time, the only proof of its existence was in the *Romancero*, where Hugo went for material for *Ruy Blas* and *Hernani*.

In France the Tendency was in full swing, and it is a notable fact that University education was suspended for a time and, whatever the motives, we are inclined to regard this proceeding as a terrible blow to the old tradition: more than this, some of the leading lights of the new Tendency had no University education, and so were not at all imbued with the ideas of the past. This Tendency had invaded the realm of painting, for we see the school of David falling into disrepute.

In 1818 Delavigne publishes his *Messéniennes*, a poem which is a fair example of lyric poetry, but it was not until the appearance of the *Méditations* of Lamartine (1820) that the Tendency becomes quite palpable. In 1822 De Vigny gives us his earlier poems, and in 1823 C. Nodier gathers round himself E. and A. Deschamps, Vigny, and forms the first *Cénacle*, composed of ardent

young men who were not quite free from the taint of Classicism. Hugo is friendly but, even in 1824, he says: "C'est ce qui le détermine aujourd'hui à fortifier cette publication nouvelle d'une déclaration simple et loyale, laquelle le met à l'abri de tout soupçon d'hérésie dans la querelle qui divise aujourd'hui le public lettré" (*Préface des Odes et des Ballades*); thus he shews himself independent of both parties. Musset sets forth the doctrines in *Les lettres de Dupuis et Cottonnet*, where they are treated in a manner which is closely allied to the general method of the Romanticists. In 1823 Lamartine produces another new work, *Les Nouvelles Méditations*: and, in the same year, *La Muse Française* was founded to be the organ of the new Tendency, while the *Globe* (founded 1824) was generally sympathetic, though neutral. In 1826 Hugo has advanced a little, for we find him demanding in another preface (*Les Odes et Ballades*) *la liberté dans l'art*; and, in the same year, De Vigny publishes *Les Poèmes antiques et modernes*. Hugo was clearly ill at ease, and it is not until 1827, when he publishes *La Préface de Cromwell*, that he is in his right place. The preface gives us the direction of the Tendency in concise form. In 1829 is formed the second *cénacle*, when Nodier united Hugo, Ste Beuve, Dumas, Vigny, and Musset; this is different from the first in that they were all ardent reformers, and this union of talents exercised a great influence on the Tendency.

In criticism Stendhal, in his *Racine et Shakespeare*, can be said to have helped on the Tendency, in so far as he opposed imitation, but otherwise, his contribution is not of much value. We can now mention Ste Beuve as the critic of the Tendency, and as the author of the poems of J. Delorme which are noted for their sad experiences. In 1828 we find Villemain giving his lectures on literature, in which he closely follows the inspiration and manner of Madame de Staël.

This period of French history is noted for the progress of scientific thought, and it was only natural

that this phase of thought should have its reflection in literature. Now for the first time History is treated in a scientific manner in France. A. Thierry publishes his *Études* in 1817, and in 1820 appear his letters on the history of France, and in 1825 he follows this up with a history of the Norman Conquest. Guizot publishes in 1823 his *Essays on French History*; Michelet, Mignet, continue the tradition. The writings of all these historians are not like those of their predecessors who made use of history as a party weapon: they treat events in a scientific manner, and invent a style peculiar to their subject. Society is treated as a living reality, and the individual and his aspirations have their proper place so that they contribute towards the realisation of the Tendency.

Another new development is the novel—a production which was now, for the first time, really understood. The first work of any note is the *Adolphe* of B. Constant (a masterpiece of psychological insight), inspired by the influence of Rousseau and Chateaubriand; then there is another work of the same class, the *Obermann* of Senancour. The next work of any note is the *Smarra* of C. Nodier, a masterpiece of weird thought and adventure, arising from the same frame of mind as the *Adolphe*. In 1823 Hugo publishes *Hans d'Islande*, a book shewing great originality, but vitiated by florid language; of the same type is the *Cinq-Mars* of De Vigny. The *Charles IX.* of Mérimée belongs to the new Tendency, in that it represents a type of work in which the individual plays a large part, though the work itself is condensed to a very small space.

It is a characteristic of these youthful authors to attempt all branches of literature, and that with tolerable success, but they cast longing eyes particularly on the theatre. Letourneur's translations of Shakespeare, coupled with the works of Ducis, helped the Tendency. In 1809 B. Constant publishes a translation of the *Wallenstein* of Schiller, one of the most romantic pieces

in existence ; and Mérimée is about the first to follow a natural inspiration, and not a fixed rule, in *Clara Gazul* (1825). Then comes *Cromwell* and its preface ; in 1829 Dumas composes *Henri III.* and, in the same year, Vigny gives his *More de Venise*, entirely based upon Shakespeare. The culminating point is reached with the production of *Hernani*. It was produced at the Théâtre Français, and the opposition had only been restive under the continual influx of innovations, but now they felt that the decisive moment had arrived. The Romanticists and the Classicists were there in full force, and it is sufficient to state that *Hernani* won the battle for progress.

CHAPTER V.

THE *GLOBE* AND POETRY.

Sept. 30th, 1824. *Chants Hellènes*, by Guiraud.

GUIRAUD had written these songs to succour Greek refugees, and thus, by his humanitarian aim, disarmed criticism. The following words deserve our attention : "on peint mal ce qu'on n'a pas vu ; peut-être même l'héroïsme de la Grèce est-il au-dessus de ce que peuvent concevoir nos imaginations d'occident." This is part of the inspiration which the stirring events in the East were rousing, but the *Globe* rightly quotes this as an example of the many failures in this category. Can we not see in these words the desire expressed for such works as the *Orientales* of Hugo, where the East is sung of in poetic, though somewhat unreal language ?

Guiraud is said to belong to the school of *La Muse Française* ; and the critic, though praising him for breaking away from the past and taking part in the realities of life, goes on to deplore that he and Delavigne have become the victims of a system, and thus lost their originality. The one achievement of these poets was to have left a system ; so we cannot accept the statement that they had espoused another. Theirs was a purely individual inspiration, and their faults were, after all, the individualistic expression of the aspirations of a youthful and ardent generation. This criticism is harsh, but can be traced to an inherent dislike of *La Muse Française* ; the *Globe* was a respectable liberal, and not an ultra-

romantic organ. The impression one receives from the poem is that it is rather an artificial memorial to Byron; the very fault which we meet with in the *Orientales*—the imagination taking the place of actual knowledge of the situations; and in such circumstances it is impossible, as the *Globe* puts it, to reproduce *la couleur locale*. The best part of the article is where the critic blames some of the metaphors; for instance, Byron is likened unto *une fusée volante*. These phrases can be passed over as due to the exuberance of youth, and, in fact, most of the excesses of the Tendency are due to the same cause. *Ipsara*, on the other hand, is noted for its versification; a foretaste of the prowess of Hugo in this direction.

Dec. 2nd, 1824.

"On nous adresse un grand nombre de pièces de poésies légères; presque toutes renferment des vers heureux et pleins de grâce; mais bien peu ont assez de bonheur dans l'ensemble pour que nous puissions les offrir à nos lecteurs. Il nous sera, cependant, toujours agréable de recevoir ces envois, et nous serons heureux d'avoir à publier les pièces que nous aurons distinguées." This is the one feature which differentiates the *Globe* from *La Muse Française*; they are willing to publish any piece, provided it is of sufficient merit. All works are treated according to their literary value; barbarisms and solecisms are to be avoided. The following words with regard to the *Trois Lampes* of Fauriel, "on sent trop l'influence de cette mauvaise école qui met de l'intention dans chaque mot," shew us plainly that the *Globe* had no sympathy with the word-conjuring poetry of Delille; yet it took men a long while to leave it off.

Feb. 10th, 1825. *La Fiancée de Bénarès*, by Chasles.

The critique is not of much importance in itself; but there are considerations which are valuable, as shewing

how the *Globe* differs from the modern authors. In *La Préface de Cromwell*, Hugo claims absolute freedom in his choice of subjects, while the *Globe* speaks of *un choix malheureux*. Of course, Hugo's position is the ideal one; and it would be a distinct advantage if we could follow this out; but we have to take things as they are, so that here again the *Globe* is true to its plea for a return to *la vérité*. The prognostics of the critic about the decay of Orientalism hardly prove correct, as can be seen from the preeminent success of the *Orientales*, which was due to their wealth of imagination. Nevertheless the remarks about the lack of accuracy of words deserve every notice. The criticism passed upon the author is severe because he claimed to be *romantique* (in the sense of original). The preface to the work contains pertinent views on the needs of the age; and the *Globe* complains that newspapers hail these views, as putting an end to the acrimonious discussion then raging, while, in reality, these views belonged to the old *régime*. The *Globe* thus knew the needs of the age, but it was independent of other papers, and rightly so at this time, because, besides *Les Harmonies*, no really great work had appeared. All the poets were serving their apprenticeships, and it was hardly fair to say that the work of rebuilding the literary fabric was over. M. Jouy expresses the following idea, "nous sommes dans un siècle où il n'y a point d'idées"; the *Globe*, naturally, criticises this statement, alleging that the century was noted for its great events, and that these were the outcome of lofty ideas. Since it was a time of great ideas, surely literature itself would be rich in noble inspirations. This consideration brings us back to the view expressed by Madame de Staël, then by Villemain, and lastly by Bonald, that "la littérature, c'est l'expression de la société." The main object of the *Globe* is to criticise this dictum of Bacon, "L'amour des nouveautés et l'idolâtrie de l'antiquité sont les deux fléaux des lettres." It advises the poets to be modern in all things but,

after all, this statement sums up the position of the *Globe*.

Feb. 25th, 1825. *Mélanges Poétiques*. Guttinger.

The critic complains that the young poets, delighted with the success of *Les Méditations* of Lamartine, did nothing but copy out these, and so lost their originality. This imitation went under the name of Romanticism; these remarks prove that the *Globe* did not praise them when they were undeserving thereof. It is a pity that the critic did not shew that imitation was incompatible with individuality for, even where Lamartine attempted to copy his own inspiration, he failed. We go further, and say that the imitation of a certain inspiration is contrary to individuality; events will appeal in a different manner, even to the same man, at different times. Imitation was no part of the Tendency. The *Mélanges* were not superior to the *Méditations*, for, while the name of Lamartine is still revered, that of Guttinger has sunk into oblivion. The *Globe*, as we have previously stated, hated all excesses, and Lamartine, though often mystical, fulfilled the conditions of *la vérité*, in that he expressed his own feelings. This idealism, with all its unnaturalness, is much preferable to the pampered style of the older authors, because it does, at least, connote originality; the blending of the real and the imaginative constitutes the ultimate goal of all efforts. Lyricism, as Hegel puts it, is only true when "les passions de l'âme et les affections du cœur, ne sont matière de pensée poétique que dans ce qu'elles ont de général, de solide et d'éternel." Why praise *le laisser-aller* of Guttinger, and advise him not to abjure it, when that was the outstanding weakness of Lamartine? We are forced to the conclusion that the position of the *Globe*, with regard to Lamartine, was one of undisguised hostility.

March 31st, 1825. *Les Chansons Nouvelles*. Béranger.

The poems are very light, and seem all on the surface, but Béranger has such a naïve way of expressing himself that we are almost forced to confess their reality. They deal with subjects which were agitating the minds of all thoughtful Frenchmen, and they leave a pleasant impression on the mind of the reader. The reason for their popularity can be found in the fact that they voiced contemporary opinion, thus naturally forming part of this Tendency which we are considering. The critic acknowledges the success of the poems, and remarks that Béranger, following the bent of the age, has become more melancholy. The *Globe* would hardly have taken any notice of them unless there was something underlying the words; it betrays itself in entire sympathy with the new aspirations of France.

May 4th, 1825. *Poésies de Mademoiselle L.*

At the beginning of the article we find the following words, "il est à regretter que *La Muse Française* ne rend plus ces oracles qui, bien qu'un peu obscures, avaient pourtant leur intérêt." The *Globe*, though often at variance with *La Muse*, yet here at least regards, with some favour, the publication of the works of the youthful poets, proving to us that the difference between them is purely one of criticism and not of personal antagonism. The *Globe* is ready to help on all young authors, but, contrary to *La Muse*, there is no question of confining the columns of the paper to one particular class; nor are they to be judged according to the standard of a certain school. The poems of Mademoiselle L. are stated to be different from the florid productions of *La Muse*. There is nothing in the poems themselves to call for any notice, but we should like to emphasise two considerations raised by the critic. (1) There was a danger of self-contemplation becoming nauseous.

(2) There was to be no imitation of classical authors. The *Globe* judges both parties from the standpoint of reason, thus maintaining its progressive character.

June 21st, 1825. *Élégies*. L. Halévy.

The first elegy, *Le malade à la campagne*, gives us the inner feelings of an invalid, and we are impressed by their naturalness. Though favouring this naturalness, the critic is careful to notice the stilted manner in which some of the younger poets treated this kind of subject. The second elegy, *Le Vieillard en Enfance*, is said to have been influenced by *La Messénienne de Waterloo*, but it is strange that the critic does not proffer any remarks on this imitation. *La Messénienne* represented an earlier phase of the Tendency, at a time when it was indistinct and undetermined; Halévy, in imitating this, could not hope to be natural. Imitation of a known quantity is blameworthy, but to attempt to imitate what cannot be exactly gauged is bound to end in failure. Here again we have evidence to prove the independence of the *Globe*.

July 7th, 1825. *La Vision*. Delphine Gay. Anon.

The critic deplores that such a young, tender-hearted person was spoilt by adulation, and also asks whether any of her admirers, who included Lamartine, Hugo, Musset and Vigny, had not moral courage enough to give her sound advice. There is no objection, says the critic, to choosing the theme of *Le Sacre*, but authors ought to be true to themselves and to the ideals of their time. These few considerations amply demonstrate that the *Globe*, though entirely modern, had reason to criticise the chief poets of the Tendency. The *Globe* blames the practice of making Middle Age characters like Jeanne d'Arc express such modern ideas as "the liberty of the press." She seems to be a follower of Rousseau,

"Sous les verts peupliers qui bordent nos prairies,
Hier j'avais porté mes vagues rêveries."

She, however, hardly reached the same intensity of feeling. The account of the ceremony at Rheims is good, but the message of Jeanne d'Arc is very unreal. For what influence would such a message have on modern minds? The versification is good, but there is no real depth of feeling and no manner of individuality. The *Globe* contents itself with stating that there is a trace of the influence of Soumet, but we would rather attribute this absence of real feeling to the fact that she was continually in society, and had no time for meditation.

July 7th, 1825. *Les Oiseaux du Sacre*. Madame Tastu.

This poem takes up the same theme, but instead of seeking stilted phrases, pleads for the birds which were kept for the ceremony. Madame Tastu then goes on to demand liberty for her native land. There is a sincere ring about the poem, and the individuality of the author can easily be seen. Our critic remarks, "on dirait que Madame Tastu l'a dérobée à Béranger ou plutôt, c'est le cœur et l'imagination d'une femme." Great emphasis is laid on the poem being the just expression of contemporary society, but it is hardly justifiable to say *point de personnalité*, for that was the crying need after the insipid compositions of the Pseudo-Classicists. We meet here also with a splendid definition of lyricism; "l'accord du sentiment particulier du poète avec le sentiment universel." This not only coincides with Hegel's definition (quoted above), but it is also a modification of the protest of the *Globe* against the individualism of some poets; a quality which became so intensely idealistic that it could not be realised by the ordinary reader.

June 30th, 1825. *Chant du Sacre*. Lamartine.

The theme refers to the coronation of the French King, consequent upon the reestablishment of the monarchy. He continues the tradition of Chateaubriand,

une foi catholique et monarchique,—a tradition which we meet with in the earlier works of Hugo. This peculiarity can be attributed to the desire for Middle Age subjects ; this was a period when the two faiths were paramount. The particular subject *Le Sacre* afforded room for the expression of noble sentiments, but we must confess that the poem left an unfavourable impression on our minds, because the ceremony, as described by Lamartine, is not a whit like the historical account. The theme before us is a noble one: it is not only treated in a commonplace manner, but also panders to the ruling house ; there are, however, some stray passages of rare merit. If more proof of this is desired, we can refer the reader to the preface of the poem. "L'auteur, en voulant porter aux pieds du roi ce faible tribut de ses sentiments pour un prince dont le règne est l'aurore du bonheur de la France, n'a pas cru devoir s'astreindre scrupuleusement aux formes modernes du Sacre; formes que l'état présent de notre monarchie modifiera peut-être encore; il en a emprunté les principaux traits aux cérémonies guerrières qui, dans les temps chevaleresques, accompagnaient cette auguste consécration." Lamartine blends the ancient and modern, and the union of these two elements would not have much influence on French thought. Lamartine had a strong following in this particular direction, and naturally, it did not augur well for the future of French literature. All his productions were unreal, because they did not partake of the strong individuality of the age ; this special theme was too concrete for the genius of Lamartine. The critic wonders how the poet of solitude will fare when describing the affairs of the world. The reason alleged for the failure of the poem is that the brilliancy of the scene has turned the head of one whose sole delight was absolute solitude, so much so that the poet is lost sight of in the words spoken by the King. Lamartine's imagination has run away with him, and naturalness is at a discount. In the latter portion of the work, the poet recovers his wonderful

charm of manner which is intense in its vagueness, and it is difficult to recognise therein the poet of *Les Méditations*. Lamartine, like Chateaubriand, possessed the gift of harmony; this quality had its charms, but he passed through life as a disinterested spectator; and he fails to be purely lyrical, because he is not sufficiently acquainted with human nature. The critic, though temperate in his remarks, has hardly said enough about the unreality of the poem. The criticism can be considered quite fair from the point of view of the Tendency. He has a thrust at the union of the ancient and modern; and this is more than interesting, because some of the young poets felt very strongly on this point. Imagination and individuality, when carried to excess, are condemned: true individuality is to be gained by seeking the society of our fellow-creatures, and giving our impressions of them. The *Globe* has no sympathy with the prevalent vagueness, because it was carried to such an excess that hardly anyone could understand it. The criticism on Lamartine is true, and the *Globe*, while hailing these poems, and especially *Les Méditations*, as the spontaneous effort of an individual, did not think that every sort of personal inspiration was healthy. We thus see that reason is brought to bear on every topic by the *Globe*, and its editors are not blinded by any partisan spirit.

Aug. 6th, 1825. *Childe Harold*. Lamartine. E. D.

Childe Harold is a poem of Byron's, and the hero is no one but the poet who describes his voyage to Greece. Lamartine resumed the subject where Byron left it, and in no wise can it be called an imitation. He has simply taken the name of the hero and the form of the poem in order to shew his respect for a man whom he loved so well. His ideas are his own, and the style and manner are quite French. The one dominant feature of the poem is the manner in which the author expresses his

own feelings, but, just as in *Les Méditations*, these feelings are so vague that we cannot follow them at times; this is due to the exclusiveness of the poet, and not to any studied effort at making himself uncommon. The religious sentiment is very strong, and this arises from personal conviction; in fact, the work is a great individualistic effort. When reading the poem we feel that Lamartine is soaring among the lofty heights of imagination, but, as soon as we descend to the realities of life, the charm has gone. The work is highly artistic, and the inspiration emanates from the sympathy which was going out from all hearts to Greece in her thralldom; later on, however, this feeling lost its reality, because poets made a system of it. We have not much desire to point out the carelessness of the versification, but we rejoice that the poet is true to his impressions, and that he does not fall back upon the uninteresting past. It would be nothing short of a calamity to have too many such works, because of the dismal failure which would await all imitators. The critic begins by stating that the imitation of an author, who has appealed to us by the expression of his own personal feelings, has never proved successful; and in this he is right, for we can record no single instance where others have followed the inspiration of Lamartine even with tolerable success. "Sa poésie semble être proscrite pour avoir rappelé celle du grand Byron"; these remarks are somewhat sweeping, because, as we have already shewn, his imitation was confined to the form. We are told that Lamartine did not belong to the modern era; we may take this as a proof of the impartial views of the *Globe*, as far as the two rival parties were concerned. His poems may have been vitiated by excessive meditation, but, even granting that, the fact that he did actually meditate was an advance upon the position of the Pseudo-Classicists; and yet the *Globe* deprives him of this honour. It is not for us to follow the critic in his remarks on the ideas which Lamartine held on the

subject of freedom, and as for Harold having the same ideas when he went to Greece, all we can say is that the poem gave us no such impression. The *Globe* blames Lamartine for derogating from the ideals of Byron, but it seems to have overlooked the fact that the ideas of the two authors were widely divergent. The critic has paid too much attention to the few passages where Modern Greece is sacrificed to the descriptions of antiquity, and the only remark we would proffer, would be to call attention to the exceptionally modern bias of the *Globe*. The criticism, as a whole, is not satisfactory, because Lamartine has certainly not travestied Byron.

Sept. 24th, 1825. *Épîtres*. Lamartine. (···), i.e. Thiers.

The critic remarks that Lamartine is eminently the poet of solitude, and that his meditation is so vague that his poetry seems to have been written in a dream. This peculiarity is so well known that the critic, though regarding this as a fault, is yet willing to let it stand as a characteristic; he is only going to consider the merits of the poet. For all that, Lamartine strikes a chord which vibrates in our own hearts; the music of the true lyric. The first *Épître* is dedicated to Hugo; in the first part thereof he describes Horace, Vergil and their songs of solitude, and their mournful meditation. He grieves that Hugo plunges into the thick of life, and advises him to come and taste the sweets of solitude. The Classicists are compared to an old dismantled castle which no one cares for. The first part of the *Épître* does not appeal to us, because it savours of the catalogue style; but when we get to the last few verses, where he refers to his dear *Muse Réveuse*, we enjoy the poem, even for its beautiful vagueness. The critic tells us that the verses are very harmonious; in this particular piece, the harmony is, perhaps, too perfect, but he is quite right in calling attention to the abject poverty of

some parts of the poem. The critic seeks to make this article a kind of palliative for the remarks offered with regard to *Le Chant du Sacre*, but it seems to us that he contradicts himself, for just at the beginning of the same article, he says that all the works of Lamartine are the same. The *Globe* was too severe on him; he heralded the dawn of freedom in the realm of literature, and we can forgive him his *nonchalance* and *rêverie*, simply for the lasting benefit which he has conferred on French literature. Why say that the poet is true to himself in *this particular instance*, whereas it is the one feature of Lamartine that he always gives us his own feelings? The second *Épître* is addressed to M. Amédée Pastoret, and it is composed on the same plan as the first. Lamartine is praised for bringing out the contrast between the field of battle and solitude, but it seems to us the most unsatisfactory part of the poem for two reasons; first, because it displays the fault of seeking after effect; second, Lamartine knew next to nothing about the clash of arms, and there is no naturalness about this part of the poem. He reverts, however, to the theme of solitude, and he describes it right well, without contrasting it with some other quality of which he was entirely ignorant. In the *Épître* entitled *Le Retour*, we revert to the theme of Nature—the foster-mother of the poet, with whom he can and does hold converse. Then, changing to lighter vein, he sings prettily, though not always with true sincerity, of the object of his affection. The critic passes over the *Épître* dedicated to Casimir Delavigne; it is important only from the point of view of literary criticism. Lamartine gives him salutary advice, especially where he needs it, pointing out that it was of no avail to allow the Muses to take part in the intestinal struggles of France. The subject taken up by Lamartine did not suit him; however he reverts, in the last verse, to *le lac qui m'est sacré*, and that is the only part of the poem which is of any literary value. It is unusual to find the following

words in the *Globe*, "la comparaison qui termine l'épître; Rousseau aurait aimé à la répéter sur son lac de Bienne ou au pied de son saule chéri d'Ermenonville"; thus supporting our contention that Rousseau and also Lamartine formed part of the Tendency. We would also call attention to the fact that this opinion was only admitted about twice or three times during the whole history of the *Globe*.

Dec. 10th, 1825. *Élégies Rémoises*. C. Anot.

There seems to be a certain freshness in these poems which is not to be found in most contemporary poetry. The reason for this is to be found in his different mode of life, for he was a man of Champagne, and knew little of Paris and its ways. The critic bemoans the fact that the elegy had not made its appearance before now, and he pertinently remarks that there was no room for the individual at the time; and so the elegy, being essentially a personal form of poetry, could not thrive. Dogma had now disappeared, and the void was great; people sought after something to satisfy their aspirations, and they took to religion. We would call particular attention to the following words—"Cette nouvelle révolution morale se fit nécessairement sentir dans la poésie; elle se manifesta par une teinte religieuse et mélancolique qui fut le caractère de la nouvelle école, caractère *que je ne prétends ni approuver ni blâmer exclusivement*, mais qu'il faut bien reconnaître." Here is another proof that the *Globe* was not going to blame or approve of any shade of the Tendency as such, for all these questions were to be decided as occasion arose. This quotation is general in its application, but the critic advises the devotees of the *poésie rêveuse* to read some of the poems of Anot, for, like Crabbe in English literature, he is a poet who depicts common everyday life to a nicety. These elegies are followed by an essay on the literary struggle which was taking place. Anot seems to be

able to judge foreign literatures with a certain amount of incisiveness, and in this he is ably supported by our critic. The *Globe*, true to its colours, deplores the absence of any reference to *l'indépendance en matière de goût*, but Anot, if he does not mention it, at least practises it in his works. The critic disclaims any sympathy with the Pseudo-Classicists, simply because they represent a dead past and not the living present.

Jan. 14th, 1826. *Les Douze Heures de la Nuit*. Michaux. Guizot.

The newspapers, according to the *Globe*, published the announcement of the appearance of a poem long before their criticism, and thus, ostensibly, the critic has a free hand. These journalistic critics think that the *amour-propre* of the poets will heal all the wounds arising from any severe judgments; this fault is to be found particularly among the Pseudo-Classicists. On the other hand, an author publishes his poem without any of this *fanfare*, and, by acknowledging his faults, hopes to be let off very easily. The writer of this article doubts the sincerity of these oft-repeated protestations of unworthiness, and goes on to say that this consideration will not influence his opinion. This fault is to be found among the younger poets, and we thus find that the *Globe* has something to say to both parties. It does not pay much attention to the unities as such, but blames Michaux for not observing the unity of action; this is quite reasonable, for, without this, chaos would reign everywhere. Michaux is twitted with being out of date; the author describes the Empire, but it can hardly be called a description of contemporary society. The critic mentions another fault, common to all the young poets—they were much too free with their local colouring. Taking all these remarks into consideration, we are forced to the conclusion that the *Globe* did not judge Michaux by the

standard of any school, but, at the same time, it does criticise unsparingly everything which savours of the past.

Feb. 4th, 1826. *Philippe Auguste.* Parceval.

The critic remarks that the friends of Parceval had ensured the success of the poem, even before it came to the public. We think that the poet has copied wholesale the *procédés* of the ancients; it sounds like an attempt to produce the *Aeneid* or the *Odyssey* in the 19th century. A complaint is made that Middle Age subjects are treated after Greek models; this is surely strange, because it is the rules which bring this about. The difficulty of having one form to express modern ideas is recognised, and here we find a neat compliment paid to Scott for his *Ivanhoe*. This difficulty is aptly compared to the use of musical instruments; different instruments produce different effects; such is the case with literature; so long as we have different impressions, we are bound to have as many forms of expression. The *Globe* supports our statement that the poets of the Tendency were only allied by certain general principles. There is one very striking statement with regard to imitation, namely that the aim of the imitator is to copy the model, and that this necessarily sends him away further from Nature and from himself. We cannot help quoting the following words, as they speak for themselves: "Romantiques, que l'on accuse d'obscurité, tâchez de comprendre cette définition classique de l'épopée," then follows the definition. The only instance where the *Globe* even palliates this indefiniteness, occurs here. The use of *le merveilleux* was possible, according to the critic, among the ancients, as their whole religious system was based thereon. There is no room for it in Christianity which deals with the individual. We might cite, as an example, the vague inspiration of Lamartine. The generality of readers did not under-

stand him, simply because he left the realm of everyday life. The *Globe* was always severe on him for this, and rightly so; for this weakness jars on common sense, and is not philosophically correct, as Hegel tells us in his definition of lyricism (quoted above). This proceeding can be adopted with advantage, according to the critic, as in the case of Scott and Byron, who understood their age. For our part, we insist that Byron and Scott did not launch forth into inordinate vagueness. They sang of the stirring events of their times. Isabelle, the heroine of the poem, has concealed from King John the relationship which exists between them. When she is a bride at the altar, the officiating priest recognises her face, and the spirits, both good and evil, reappear. The mingling of mythology and Christian theology strikes a jarring note, and it is somewhat strange to meet with an instance of the same thing in the *Génie du Christianisme* of Chateaubriand. Did the *Globe* desire to bring epic poetry and tragedy down to the level of history? Its answer is clear; "we desire men to reconstruct the past in the true sense; the poet must be human, but he must adhere to historical facts. On the other hand, we must not have a category of bald facts, devoid of imagination." These words form the key-note of the policy of the *Globe*. We are perfectly willing to admit that, as far as harmony and versification are concerned, Parceval can be ranked among the moderns, but how does the *Globe* reconcile the position which it takes up with its modern bias? The inconsistency seems to lie in the statement that Parceval forms part of the Tendency, in spite of his wholesale imitation of other authors.

Feb. 18th, 1826. *Les Jésuites*. Barthélemy and Méry.

In the preface to the volume we find the following phrase, "la poésie épique vit de fictions"; this is, at best, but half a truth. Epic poetry must have some connection with real life, and it is in this particular that the

poem is worthy of notice. Though treating a very contentious subject, the authors voice the opinions of their age, and there is a healthy vigour about their expressions. The vocabulary is very simple; the authors have combined the words together so very well, and the versification is such that the whole piece is quite majestic. The two lines,

".....en brisant Pagode et Manitou
Le Sachem Muscogulge et le Fakir Indou,"

shew us the influence of Chateaubriand, where he takes Christianity as the basis of the new movement. The critic complains that the dual authorship is visible in the poem; it is hard to reconcile this statement with the fact that there is one main idea running through it. Nor can we agree that the versification is harsh. Again the critic does not state his opinion about the authors' connection with the Tendency, but it affords us yet another proof that the *Globe* does not look at matters in this *whisk* light.

March 4th, 1826. *Mélodies Poétiques et Chants d'Amour*.
Cersay. Guizot.

Without proceeding further than the title, we can almost detect the influence of Byron. The well-known vagueness is present, but the poem is highly inspired, and this one consideration sets it far above the hackneyed forms of the Pseudo-Classicists. The pleasure derived from the poem is purely momentary, and, as soon as we descend to the realities of life, it vanishes like the morning dew before the sun's rays. There can be no doubt, as the critic tells us, of the influence of the Lake Poets upon French literature; but he seems to us to have gone wrong where he speaks of this *genre* as becoming naturalised in France. Its chief features were already there, and they were only intensified by these foreign influences. Melancholy within proper limits is right enough, but it

becomes reprehensible when it is carried to excess. The *Globe* expresses liberal opinions, but it does not allow its liberalism to become licence. The poet is not sufficiently acquainted with the realities of life to leave a lasting impression on his readers. The critic is severe because of the real talent of de Cersay; thus the *Globe* fosters genius, and does not owe adhesion to any school. We cannot, as the critic seems to do, expect vigour in this kind of poetry. The young poets may, perhaps, not have been great thinkers, but surely it is somewhat of an exaggeration to state that "M. Pauthier de Cersay était dupe et complice de son imagination." This is one of the very few excessive criticisms passed by the *Globe* on its contributors.

April 1st, 1826. *Les Veillées Françaises*. M. Guizot.

"La destinée d'un ouvrage s'accomplit en dépit de tous les efforts de l'amitié et de toutes les manœuvres des coteries; on a beau crier à la merveille et tourmenter l'opinion publique, elle ne s'émeut pas sur parole. Il serait sans doute fort commode qu'elle enregistrât de confiance les arrêts des journaux; mais pour notre malheur et peut-être par notre faute, elle conserve le droit de les casser ou de les confirmer à son gré, et prononce toujours en dernier ressort; ainsi tous les éloges prodigués à un ouvrage médiocre ne sauraient en prévenir la chute; seulement ils lui donnent l'air d'un triomphe." The *Globe*, as a purely literary organ, did well to call attention to this canker, which was destroying the very sap of literary life in France. Of course the Pseudo-Classicists were guilty of this, but also, to some extent, the *Muse Française*, which published the works emanating from *Le Cénacle*, irrespective of merit. This poem was an attempt to revert to French history, but it ended in a dismal failure, for M. had made up his mind to praise Napoleon on every possible occasion. Scott and Hugo succeeded in the same direction, because they

sought lessons from the past in the light of the present, and not *vice versâ*.

April 15th, 1826. *Poèmes Antiques et Modernes.*
De Vigny.

De Vigny is a poet who stands quite apart from everyone else; he gives his own opinions of things, and is perfectly modern in his style and choice of subjects. These poems are his earliest efforts, and these remarks are not to be taken as a final opinion on his genius. He offers us what he calls *un livre mystique*, and there is no more striking example of that vagueness so characteristic of modern poets. Take *Éloa*, for example, where an angel is created from a tear of Christ. The poem is simply magnificent, brimful of noble thoughts which seem to vanish when we descend to the realities of life. Another section of the volume is devoted to Biblical subjects; he is, at this stage, profoundly imbued with the Christian spirit of Chateaubriand, Lamartine, and Hugo, though later on he became quite a pessimist. In the purely modern poems, especially *Dolorida*, *La Frégate la Sérieuse*, we meet with some signs of the healthy individuality of the age. We discover traces of the meditative spirit of Lamartine, but De Vigny was a more profound thinker than the generality of his contemporaries. He was not, in fact, fully understood by his contemporaries; ~~the French language did not seem to be sufficient for the expression of his thoughts.~~ De Vigny's versification is nothing out of the common; ~~the poems themselves do not, for one moment, compare with those of Hugo, but they exhibit the same ardent longings for something noble.~~ They are but his earliest efforts, and, judging from them, we can say that he belongs to the Tendency. The critic attributes the absolute inequality of the works to the poet's desire of complete separation from the Pseudo-Classicists. The reason is that De Vigny was too much of a genius to

bind himself to any system, but the critic, perhaps, did not perceive this at the time. We can further attribute the inequality of production to the presence or absence of inspiration. The *Globe* cares not whether he is like other poets or not, but simply advises him how to become a good poet, "Qu'elle (la Muse) conserve sa libre pensée, sa franche allure et tous ses charmes natifs; mais qu'elle épure son goût, qu'elle apprenne à choisir ses mots et ses idées, à s'exprimer clairement et surtout à parler purement sa langue." The *Globe* will have none of the unsettled inspiration of modern poets, but it wishes them success in their struggle for freedom of expression. It seems to us almost superfluous to urge the young poets to write pure French, for, generally speaking, the Romantic poets, and especially Hugo and Vigny, were very careful in this matter. The word *goût* must not be confounded with *le bon goût*; the *Globe* simply desires the young poets to cultivate an elevated taste. We then conclude that the *Globe* is purely modern, but, at the same time, it does not spare even these authors, when they follow the general faults of the Tendency.

May 2nd, 1826. *Poésies Érotiques*. Tissot. Sainte-Beuve.

The critic here gives us two phases of the Tendency; Béranger expressed public opinion, while Lamartine's poetry ended in beautiful meditation. Both were, according to the *Globe*, modern; and this view coincides with our statement that the Tendency could not have been a fixed system, as it admitted of at least two constructions. Tissot has not made much impression on the critic's mind; in one place, he is a Pseudo-Classicist, because his ideas are old-fashioned; in the other, he is regarded as a Romanticist on account of his vague and unreal poetry. Hence we see that the two terms do not influence the *Globe* at all, as it lays stress on literary merit alone.

July 22nd, 1826. *La Prise du Château Rivoli.*
Barthélemy and Méry.

The critic opens the article by complaining of a practice which was far too common in France, that of praising the works of certain authors without giving reasons. This one consideration proves to us that the *Globe* stood out for true criticism, and not for the works of a certain school; neither was it a party organ, for we see here a purely political production, judged simply from the standpoint of literature. Though Barthélemy and Méry had chosen a subject dealing with contemporary French life, they are blamed for paying too much attention to fiction; for poetry consists of inspiration, and not of imitation: "nous égalons trop vite des artistes formés par le travail et l'imitation à des créateurs inspirés." The critic again touches on the individuality of poets, and the means of strengthening this quality is as follows: "la liberté et l'originalité ne viendront que dans le travail solitaire"; but we are not to infer that he favours that self-contemplation which descends to eccentricity.

Aug. 12th, 1826. *L'art poétique.* A. Guiget.

This article could well be passed over except for two interesting references to be found therein. The words *romantisme hypocondriaque*, and the disparaging remarks thereon, prove conclusively that the *Globe* was in favour of no excess of any description. "Et souvent, on ne sait de qui il veut rire, des classiques ou des romantiques"; these terms mean next to nothing to the critic.

— Sept. 7th, 1826. *Chateaubriand.*

The appearance of the complete works of Chateaubriand was an opportune moment for the discussion of his works. The critic pays particular attention to his

Essai sur les Révolutions. It is not within our province to enter into the reasons which induced Chateaubriand to change his opinions, but we would draw attention to the following words which are to be found in the article: "C'est là le propre du génie de se retrouver au fond toujours le même." We do not perceive the same opinions in *Le Génie du Christianisme*; there had been a complete change, and it was under the influence of the *new* opinions that Chateaubriand made his mark in French literature, and that he influenced the Tendency. The *Globe* expected every author to express his own aspirations and those of his age; "la vie de l'homme expliquera les livres; les livres expliqueront la vie."

Sept. 16th, 1826. *Luce de Lancival.* C. Magnin.

These poems, in themselves, do not come within the purview of the work, but there are one or two important considerations which arise out of them. The *Globe* was a paper with liberal sympathies, neither Romantic nor Classical, but purely literary. The following words are interesting: "Quant à nous, qui ne sommes point élèves de M. Luce, et qui, ne l'ayant point connu, ne saurons l'admirer par souvenir, nous demandons la permission de le juger tout simplement *sur ses œuvres*, comme homme et comme écrivain."

Oct. 19th, 1826. *Les Poésies.* L. Brault. Guizot.

The poet who lived under the Empire is praised for giving expression to the opinions of his time. The *Globe*, which certainly did not share his opinions, is disinterested enough to praise his literary qualities, a feature which one will not see in any other periodical. The critic blames the poet for failing to express himself in suitable terms, though admitting the difficulty of reproducing the general ideas of society in an individualistic form. The *Globe*, generally speaking, pleads for

naturalness of expression, and thus we are at a loss how to explain the following words: "Dans un siècle où le luxe fait partie de la morale publique, un simple vêtement n'est plus de mise; il faut de la parure et une certaine recherche, qui, sans exclure la simplicité, fait aussi une large part à la coquetterie." The standpoint is rather difficult to understand, but the words, "sans exclure la simplicité," save it from the stigma of inconsistency. The statement quoted above can also be attributed to the well-known doctrine enunciated by the *Globe*, and previously by Bonald and Madame de Staël—"la littérature est l'expression de la société."

Nov. 4th, 1826. *Odes et Ballades*. V. Hugo.

The critic finds fault with the excesses to which the genius of Hugo goes, but he admits the great pleasure to be derived from reading the poems. The imagination, which carried the poet to such extremes, was rendered more powerful by the presence of a strong mind. The *Globe* cannot understand how such a genius could produce these inartistic efforts, but the editors seem to forget that talent knows no limit; furthermore, these poems were amongst the earliest productions of Hugo. Meditation is suggested as a palliative; of course, this might introduce some kind of individuality, but it would resemble that of Lamartine—an individuality which degenerated into eccentricity, because it had no connection with the outside world. These remarks serve to shew how keenly the *Globe* felt the necessity of a true inspiration; but the editors would not, as in the case of Hugo, hear of this individuality becoming so intense that no one could understand it. *Les Deux Îles* is a characteristic poem; the very title suggests a weakness of his—antithesis—and the poem itself is full of it. In the first part he favours Napoleon, but this admiration is soon changed into bitterness. The most remarkable feature is the artistic manner in which he has arranged the

different verses ; the rhymes are majestic, even in their simplicity. The *Globe*, contrary to the usual practice, congratulates the poet on his choice of subject. The one idea of the poem is the towering height of Napoleon so that it is difficult, as the poet does, to regard the sentiments of Hugo as too general. The article is in general agreement with the poet, except on the score of the too frequent use of *le grandiose* and *le merveilleux*. *Un Chant de Fête de Néron* is the next poem brought to our notice. Hugo amply demonstrates his powers of penetration in the incisive analysis of the motives which urged Nero to destroy Rome. This effort is hardly a laboured one, as the critic would suggest ; on the contrary, it is a work of pure genius. The *Globe*, thanks to its independent position, could warn him against the ever-recurring faults : "N'être bizarre que malgré lui ; mais quand l'originalité naturelle est gâtée par la prétention à l'originalité, le lecteur ne jouit pas complètement de ce qui est vrai, par le souvenir et la crainte de ce qui ne l'est pas."

Nov. 18th, 1826. *La Fée et la Péri*. V. Hugo.

In this poem, which is the last of the *Odes et Ballades*, Hugo takes up an old story, and puts it before us with such a wealth of imagination that we do not get tired of reading it. We feel, however, that the ideas expressed therein are too fine for the material world, and, as in the case of Lamartine, it belongs to a realm far removed from ours. There is no question of the abuse of any literary quality as in some of his other poems ; but productions of this nature can never have a popular vogue, because they are not sufficiently true to Nature. The *Globe* publishes extracts of poems without any comment, just to allow the reader to judge for himself ; this practice is followed even where the critic and author disagree. The *Globe* is severe enough with Hugo, but, as in all other cases, prejudice does not tamper with justice. In his descriptions of the East ; there is a foretaste of the

florid imagination of *Les Orientales*; and the critic disapproves of it, because it is not entirely founded on fact.

Dec. 16th, 1826. *Rome à Paris*. Barthélemy and Méry.

We can infer the standpoint of the *Globe* from the following remarks which deal with the so-called literary journals. "Les journalistes, ne lisant jamais ce qu'ils louent et, citant d'un ouvrage de leur couleur ce que le libraire a corné d'office dans l'exemplaire de la rédaction. Remarquez les mêmes formules et presque les mêmes phrases pour tous les écrivains d'une opinion pareille; on préconise du même style, Béranger et Viennet; M. Brault et Casimir Delavigne."... "Il faut de la vraisemblance même dans le faux"; here again we are told, in a paradoxical manner, that truth must be the foundation of all literary productions. We are given to understand indirectly that the poems of Lamartine do not have a lasting popularity, and the reason we would adduce is their lack of reality.

Jan. 2nd, 1827. *Odes et Ballades*. V. Hugo. Sainte-Beuve.

The article opens with a short statement of the condition of poetry in France under the Restoration. All the young poets, imbued with the spirit of *Le Génie du Christianisme*, turned towards religion and mystical beliefs; they were keen on Middle Age subjects, but they treated them in the spirit of modernity. They had certain general principles in common, but stress must be laid on the wide and undetermined character of these principles. These were "le platonisme en amour, le Christianisme en mythologie, et le royalisme en politique." A close union between the poets was only natural, because their contemporaries would have nothing to do with their ideas. Delavigne and Béranger

were their exponents, because they expressed the ideals of the period. We would call especial attention to the distinction drawn between *La Muse Française* and these two poets, as shewing exactly that the *Globe* was not a Romantic organ in the generally accepted sense of the term. Lamartine is excepted from this category, because he is so individualistic; and, after all, he was popular, because he had a desire for higher ideals. It is incorrect to separate him entirely, as the critic does, from the other poets, because it was the appearance of *Les Méditations* which really gave definite shape to the Tendency. The followers of *La Muse Française* are generally regarded as the only persons deserving of the name Romantic, but the *Globe* regarded them with disfavour, because their ideas, however beautiful they might be, were expressed in a language far too flowery. The *Muse* became defunct, and the best poets followed their own bent. There was need for real genius, as is here shewn: "Le public a besoin et surtout aura besoin de poésie; rassasié de réalités historiques, il reviendra à l'idéal avec passion; il aimera à se reposer dans la région aujourd'hui délaissée de rêves et à s'asseoir en voyageur aux fêtes où le conviera l'imagination." We have entered into this consideration at some length, as it demonstrates the fact that the *Globe* had nothing to do with the Romantic School as such, but that it set out from the point of view of the needs of the time, in so far as they were consonant with the dictates of good taste in literature. Hugo hated the Revolution, and the style of his political poems is inspired by this feeling of hatred. The *Globe* naturally favoured the free use of imagination, but it cried halt when this feature was carried to excess. The mention of *Hans d'Islande* was hardly necessary, because it was one of Hugo's earliest works. The criticism is none too severe, but, seeing that the crudeness of Hugo's style is blamed, the *Globe*, to be perfectly logical, ought to have made the same remarks on the passages where the imagination is so intense that

no one can follow it; for both faults really amount to the same thing. The critic has done a signal service in calling attention to the descriptions executed by Hugo; they are far from being real, and, though having pretensions to local colouring, they blind us by their extravagance. We cannot, however, follow the critic in his remarks on Hugo's abuse of the power of analysis; for this is the one distinctive mark of his individuality, and one of the qualities which places him far above his contemporaries. The critic advises Hugo never to conceal his feelings when speaking of himself, as the one charm of the younger poets lies in this direction.

Jan. 9th, 1827. *Odes et Ballades*. V. Hugo. Sainte-Beuve.

The same critic gives us a masterly psychological sketch of Hugo, and it is so abstruse that we must quote a large portion thereof in order to do justice to the remarks. "Il n'est aucune âme tant soit peu délicate et cultivée qui ne se sent émue à l'aspect de certaines scènes de la nature ou au spectacle de certains événements historiques. L'expression n'a retenu de la pensée qu'une faible réminiscence qu'elle laisse à peine entrevoir sous sa pâleur; ou bien, elle a prêté à cette pensée trop d'éclat, trop de saillie et l'a altérée en y ajoutant; c'est même là le défaut ordinaire d'un esprit impétueux et fort. Son activité s'imprime sans ménagement à tout ce qui tombe sous sa prise; sa brusque imagination, pour une ou deux fois qu'elle rencontre avec bonheur, est 20 fois en défaut, froissant ce qu'elle ne devrait que toucher, dépassant ce qu'il lui suffisait d'atteindre. De là, une physionomie particulière de talent qu'il nous sera plus aisé de retracer d'après Hugo, car c'est lui-même que nous venons de signaler. La plupart des idées de Hugo, avant d'être mises en français et en vers, ont été dans sa tête des rêveries originales et quelques-unes de sublimes rêveries. Mais en passant à l'état de style, elles ont subi,

le plus souvent, d'étranges violences. Loin de s'affaiblir et de s'effacer, comme il arrive chez certains talents impuissants à rien reproduire, elles se sont forcées et chargées outre mesure. Ce n'est pas que le poète se forme du beau une image grossie et exagérée, bien au contraire, il nous semble intimement pénétré des plus exquises délicatesses de l'idéal. Mais sensible et ardent comme il est, la vue d'une belle conception le met hors de lui ; il s'élance pour la saisir et s'il ne l'a pas enlevée du premier coup à son gré, il revient sur ses traces, s'agite en tout sens et se fatigue longuement autour de la même pensée, comme autour d'une proie qui lui échappe. A l'aspect de cette poursuite opiniâtre, on finit, il est vrai, par compatir à l'angoisse du poète, et par démêler sous ses efforts je ne sais quoi d'ineffable auquel il aspire. Mais plus on entre avant dans son rêve, plus, en même temps, on regrette dans son œuvre cette mollesse primitive de nuances et de contours qu'il n'a pas assez respectée. En poésie, comme ailleurs, rien de si périlleux que la force ; si on la laisse faire, elle abuse de tout ; par elle, ce qui n'était qu'original et neuf, est bien près de devenir bizarre ; un contraste brillant dégénère en antithèse précieuse. L'auteur vise à la grace et à la simplicité, et il va jusqu'à la mignardise et la simplesse ; il ne cherche que l'héroïque, et il rencontre le gigantesque ; s'il tente le gigantesque, il n'évitera pas le puéril. Hugo pourrait nous en fournir des preuves ; c'est dans les détails de ses compositions qu'il faudrait les prendre. Car nous l'avons dit, l'inspiration première en est constamment vraie et profonde." There is no doubt that Hugo's ideas were pure inspiration. His was an impulsive nature, and this characteristic is shewn by the way that his words, images, and descriptions come upon us, even before we have the time to consider what has preceded. We can never change the poet's nature, and to us it is a proof of his strong individuality ; this one consideration places him in the front rank of the Tendency. The *Globe*, as usual, desires gentler

methods, though in this case, it blames the poet's nature only. The critic argues that this force turns the sublime into the ridiculous, and, in his opinion, this is the one reason for the poet's faults, especially his weakness for antithesis. We prefer the idea that this particular fault arises from a deliberate plan, but, however much we disagree with the view here advanced, we must pay tribute to the noble motives which underlie the criticism of the *Globe*, and particularly here. We are given to understand that, if V. Hugo were true to his own opinions, these failings would disappear—a view, to a large extent, correct. Taking *L'art d'être grand-père*, for example, where there is no need to be anything but simple, it would be difficult to find more delightful reading. We know that Hugo was possessed of boundless imagination, and it is with some reason that the *Globe* praises him for his fantastic poems; but, true to their instinct of *la vérité*, the editors question the likelihood of some of his characters. "Ce que Delille et ses disciples faisaient à froid et par système, Hugo le fait surtout par inadvertence et illusion." This remark is hardly correct, because, in *Notre Dame de Paris*, he goes purposely out of his way to give us words which few people knew, and of which he was perhaps ignorant; the only difference between him and Delille was that the latter followed the old rut, while he had a way of his own. There is no need to dwell on his cleverness as a versifier, but hardly ever do we find him breaking the rules of grammar, and it was with some reason that Théophile Gautier stated that Hugo and himself were the only persons in Paris who could write French correctly. The critic hails Hugo as a great poet, and advises him to be true to his own impressions, and not to be in too great a hurry to express his ideas. The *Globe* thus welcomes him as a modern poet, but it does not hesitate to criticise where necessary.

Feb. 6th, 1827. *Peyronnéide*. Barthélemy and Méry.

The authors had incurred the displeasure of the *Globe* by imitating the faults of the followers of *La Muse Française*, but, for all that, they had caught the spirit of the age. However much the *Globe* favours the young poets, there is always something to criticise; here it is leaning towards mysticism, but it is certainly at fault in denying them the privilege of originality. *La couleur locale*, a most desirable quality when presented with some degree of faithfulness, is brought to our notice.

March 20th, 1827. *Les 7 Messéniennes Nouvelles*.
C. Delavigne. Sainte Beuve.

The original *Messéniennes* were favourably received, because Delavigne had caught the classical inspiration which suited him so well; the present poems, however, did not meet with the same favour, because they depended on new impressions taken from fresh local surroundings. We consider them, simply because they were generally regarded as modern. We would call attention to *Les Adieux à Rome*; it is full of classical allusions which do not appeal to the modern reader. Why should he be regarded as a modern poet, when he disregarded his own age so much as to say, "le présent n'a rien qui t'égale"? He could not be inspired by the present as well as by the past, "aux accents inspirés des poètes romains." We would quote these words as expressing the position of the *Globe*: "nous lui adressons sincèrement des reproches dans l'intérêt de l'art, dans le sien propre, et par conséquent dans le nôtre aussi, à nous tous jeunes gens qui sommes associés plus d'une fois à ses succès avec orgueil et avec amour." The age, according to the critic, had need of a poet to express its sentiments, but Delavigne was not the man. The true poet needs meditation, but this should be supplemented by a knowledge of the ways of the world: "il fallait alors, renonçant à des habitudes

recueillies et solitaires, se mêler aux flots de cette génération active, mouvante, orageuse, s'y plonger hardiment, et n'en sortir aux instants de méditation que pour bientôt s'y replonger encore." The *Globe* recognises the forte of Delavigne, and advises him to keep to the classical models, thus shewing that its first consideration was talent; it even preferred a Classicist who had this gift, to a Romanticist who had none.

April 24th, 1827. *Parnay*. Guizot.

The *Globe* always displayed the power of analysing, to a nicety, the needs of the age, as is shewn in the following extract: "puisque notre génération accueille avec enthousiasme les élans religieux d'une passion toute mystique, où nos aïeux n'eussent vu que les rêveries de cerveaux malades." Strange to say, Lamartine was popular for this very reason. We must not, however, misunderstand the position of the *Globe* with regard to him; it supported Lamartine in so far as he was modern, but it parted company with him as soon as he became eccentric.

Aug. 11th, 1827. *Poésies Diverses*. C. Nodier.

The *Globe* remarks that the French language was so impoverished that it did not suffice for the expression of the inward feelings of men. As C. Nodier produced such a work as *Smarra*, which was noted for its wealth of imagination and its psychological insight, we can safely claim him as belonging to the Tendency. The *Globe* acknowledges this fact, but, at the same time, blames him for his mysticism and his unequal productions. The critic has rightly praised *Les Contes en Vers*; they appeal to us, because they are so simple, and reveal the man through the poet, but, to him, they represent Nodier following the Muse for its own sake—the ideal of art.

Nov. 13th, 1827. *La Bacriade*. Barthélemy and Méry.

There is enough swing about the poem, and this is enhanced by the rapid movement of the rhythm. As it is supposed to deal with Algeria, we should expect some faithful local colouring, but the poets seem to have confounded it with the scenery of France. The passage where the Turks visit the opera lacks reality, and it becomes ridiculous with the line:—

“..... mais par un coup fatal,
Le gaz vient d’expirer dans son dernier cristal.”

We cannot accuse these poets of mysticism, but of studied carelessness; also we can, and do, condemn them for perverse imagination which alters facts. The *Globe* states that these poets possess the power of versification, but, true to its tenets, it blames them for the want of reality in their poem; they have recast the whole story—a regrettable feature, especially in a political poem. Excusing the severity of his strictures, the critic says, “et puis c’est la défense de l’art que nous ne pouvons voir sans chagrin ainsi compromis par des hommes faits pour l’honorer.” The critic favours imagination; the way to arrive at this is by meditation, and then naturalness will follow. Thus the *Globe* is a modern paper, and its criticism is always inspired by the true love of literature. Even among the severe strictures passed upon these two authors, we discover an encouraging reference to the rare flashes of inspiration to be found in the poem.

March 26th, 1828. *Le Voyage en Grèce*.
Lebrun. J. J. Ampère.

Many poets had sung of the misfortunes of Greece, and, like Byron, Lebrun takes up the same theme, and he has everything in his favour, because he had visited Greece. He gives us a true picture of the state of affairs,

and does not needlessly digress on the past glory of the country. The few remarks made about the past are just sufficient to serve as an introduction, but he remembers that he is describing Modern Greece. He thus goes back into the past to seek for lessons for his contemporaries. His descriptions are faithful, and not laden with the mannerisms of the *Orientales*. His versification and language are simple, and in this he differs considerably from the authors of the previous century. Nearly all the poems dealing with Greece had been dismal failures, because the poets tried to describe what they had never seen. The critic blames them for their languid style, and upbraids them with having stifled all sympathy for that unhappy country. The *Globe*, though calling attention to the beautiful passages of the poem, does not fully understand its dreamy imagination. The critic rightly says that the period was not at all suited to the development of poetry, because of the stirring events of the time. A hint is also given, especially to those young authors who are fond of the Middle Age subjects, to give a correct account of the periods of which they treat. "Je crois qu'une fibre poétique vibre encore dans beaucoup de cœurs à leur insu"; the *Globe* acknowledges the existence of the Tendency, but it attributes no set characteristics by which it can be known. Lebrun is congratulated for being strictly true, and especially after so much mysticism. We would perceive a slight hit at Lamartine, when the critic states that this journey was in no wise connected with the Pilgrimage of Harold. The *Globe* describes itself as "ceux qui désirent voir notre poésie se régénérer par la vérité"; but it does not evolve any fixed principles.

Oct. 28th, 1828. *Études françaises et étrangères.*
É. Deschamps.

Émile Deschamps was one of the most prominent members of the *Cénacle* to which Hugo and De Vigny

belonged; he inherited their good qualities and their faults. The first remark made by the critic is that the poet is possessed of originality; even in his imitations, he preserves his individuality. The *Globe*, true to its original ideas, praises him for blending imagination and reality; the highest praise the critic bestows on him is to rank him with Schiller. *Rodrigue* is, perhaps, the best of the series; in it he incorporates the general features of *le Cénacle*. He displays a wonderful mastery of his subject, and it is all the more creditable as it is medieval. He is possessed of a great wealth of imagination, but he should have descended oftener to the realm of everyday life, for none of his fellows reached their highest pinnacle of fame until they did so. The *Globe* praises his judicious use of *la couleur locale*, and the reason which we would adduce is that he treats the Middle Ages from a modern point of view.

Jan. 21st, 1829. *Orientales*. Hugo.

The critic opens his article with these words taken from Hugo's own preface. "Cela est-il bon? Cela est-il mauvais? Du reste ni louanges ni reproches pour les couleurs employées mais seulement pour la façon dont elles sont employées. Examinez comment le poète a travaillé, non sur quoi et pourquoi." The critic does not regard this as the view of an artist, and goes on to state that the average reader will desire more explanations; in a word, he considers that the sphere of criticism is far too narrow. We thus see that the *Globe*, in spite of its modern sympathies, diverges in its views from the chief poet of the Tendency. Though the *Globe* would go further in this matter, yet it has never once interfered with the individual liberty of the poet, and its criticisms are based upon those final words of all literary canons, and not on the fixed rules of any school. Hugo possesses, according to the critic, both energy and boldness, but his descriptions are out of all proportion to the rest

of the subject, and the display of luxuriant metaphors proves that there is no deep thought—in fact, the whole poetry appeals to the eye. All these remarks are just in their way, but the poet himself tells us, in his preface, that these poems arose from pure imagination, for he had never visited the East; as pure works of art they are unrivalled. We can thus excuse the display of the fantastic, but, at the same time, it serves to shew the position of the *Globe* with regard to any excess in this direction. We are bound to protest against the remarks of the critic; he regards this volume of poems as pure affectation. We would refer the reader to the remarks of Hugo himself—the testimony of a man who lived down a whole century of obloquy in many quarters. “Il regrette que quelques censeurs, de bonne foi d’ailleurs, se soient formé de lui une fausse idée, de manière que lui, poète, *homme de fantaisie et de caprice*, mais aussi de probité, est devenu sous leur plume, un être de raison. Il ose affirmer que ceux qui le voient ainsi, le voient mal.” The *Globe* clearly has no sympathy for any school of poetry apart from true merit,—“c’est un chef d’école qui professe en poésie, et ses leçons ne sont pas heureuses.” The *Globe*, however, gives due praise to his literary capabilities: “M. Hugo nous le pardonnera; lui qui ne veut pas que l’on demande compte au poète de ses fantaisies, il fera grâce aux scrupules d’une admiration un peu difficile; et il comprendra que l’estime et l’affection pour son beau talent ne peuvent aller avec la mollesse de la flatterie.”

March 7th, 1829. *Poèmes*. Lemercier and B. Lormian.

“Je n’en respecte pas moins l’opinion contraire”; “Que l’Académie décide si ce calembour, si la parodie toute entière s’adresse à l’ancienne ou à la nouvelle école; moi, je l’ignore.” These two quotations go far to shew that the *Globe* paid no attention to the names which the two parties arrogated to themselves, and did

not even understand the difference between them. The *Globe* further blames what it thinks wrong in both parties: "on y remarque une sensibilité véritablement paternelle pour tous les ouvrages de M. Lemercier, sans en excepter *La Panhypocrisiade*, dont le titre seul parut jadis aussi effrayant que les fantômes de V. Hugo."

March 18th, 1829. *Le Dernier Jour de Pompéi*. Gay.

The critic condemns the prevalent practice of going to Italy to seek new inspirations, because the young poets, already too imaginative, would become even more so. From an artistic point of view, we do not agree with the *Globe*; the *Graziella* of Lamartine was the result of a visit to Italy, and there is no work which, to such an extent, displays art in its purity. The *Globe* states that Byron, in his *Childe Harold*, simply recounts the story of his voyage; this is a powerful argument, for this work was produced under the same conditions as *Graziella*. No doubt Lamartine's work was a failure from the practical point of view, but it must be judged simply as a production of the imagination; both *genres* had their place in literature. We were struck by the personal inspiration displayed throughout the poem, and the critic also expresses his satisfaction with no uncertain voice: "l'important pour eux, comme pour tous les hommes, est de rester soi." In a previous article Mademoiselle Gay was blamed for following the faults of the poets of *La Muse*, but no mention is made here of vagueness of any description. This is a further proof of the independent position of the *Globe*; if it had been purely Romantic, it would have blamed her in this particular instance for not being mystical. The *Globe* had been severe on Hugo, but, strange to say, it makes use of a comparison of his. The critic likens the poems of Mademoiselle Gay to an Ionic temple, while Hugo compares one of his odes with a Gothic cathedral. True poetry comes from inspiration, and this quality also

accounts for the individuality of the poets: "la poésie ne doit pas ressembler à ces variations qui reproduisent toujours le même thème."

March 26th, 1829. *Joseph Delorme.*

As already known, Joseph Delorme is no other than Sainte-Beuve. The opening words of the article are interesting, because they shew exactly the position of the *Globe*: "voilà, sous un titre bien modeste, un livre qui fera bruit dans peu de jours parmi le petit nombre de personnes qui prennent, comme nous, un sérieux intérêt à la publication d'un nouveau recueil de vers, *et se passionnent pour ou contre les hardis tentatives de la nouvelle école.*" The critic does not take sides one way or another; his policy is to judge the literary qualities. Sainte-Beuve strikes a true note throughout his work, and the form leaves nothing to be desired. However original he may have been, says the critic, he has undergone the influence of Hugo, in both his good and bad points. This proviso with regard to "the good and bad points" reveals once more the impartiality of the *Globe*. The critic, while classifying him with the young poets whose vague inspiration is so well known, links him with René, Werther and Obermann. We would also state that, in common with the other poets, he possessed the power of introducing ordinary words into his poetry, and of making them quite noble in their new surroundings. It is not quite fair to French poets to state that these mournful strains, which reveal such abject feelings, were only to be seen in the works of the English poets; for, time after time, have we met with the same features in the works of Lamartine.

April 11th, 1829. *Joseph Delorme.* C. Magnin.

These poems generally reach a high standard of excellence; his forte is his versification, and the little

poem, *La Rime*, is interesting, as shewing that form was his ulterior object.

"Rime, l'unique harmonie
Du vers, qui, sans tes accents
Frémissements,
Serait muet au génie."

(*Œuvres*, page 29, lines 3—6.)

He displays no extraordinary power of thinking, and he differs from his contemporaries in that he has abjured his early religious influences. As a poet he was considerably inferior to them, and we were struck by this fact, especially in his mournful poem on *Suicide*. He then became opposed to the Romanticists, but, as he had not much will power, he soon returned to poetry. All his themes arise from a discontented frame of mind. We find the root of the matter in the inexplicable dissatisfaction with everything; this was by far the worst feature of the modern period, because it became so nauseous. The poems, according to the critic, were not well received by those who favoured innovations, and, in the absence of any explanation, we would remark that men desired something more tangible than this fashionable mysticism. The *Globe*, though reserving to itself the right of criticising details, congratulates the poet on his work. "Si d'ailleurs, il y a entre nous et l'école, qui se porte pour héritière d'André Chénier, quelques dissidences de principes, comme le fait entendre un peu aigrement M. Delorme; c'est une raison de plus pour nous de rendre pleinement justice à ce livre; car si l'on a bonne grâce à se montrer sévère avec les siens, c'est une étroite obligation d'être plus que juste à l'égard de ses adversaires." These words prove the existence of differences between the *Globe* and the poets, and we notice, with pleasure, the high ideal set up by its editors, especially in their criticism of opponents. By "l'école héritière d'André Chénier," the *Globe* means the Romantic poets, but there is no connection between the two, how-

ever far back Sainte-Beuve may go into the history of French literature. The critic places him in the same category as Werther and René, but he is inferior to them in that his passion is not so romantic, and does not command the same interest. After all, that is purely a question of art, but the real reason is that Delorme was not so conversant with the ways of the world as Goethe and Chateaubriand; however, his ideas, though deplorable in our eyes, have the advantage of being sincere. "Le mal du siècle" is present in his sadness, but the impressions of the moment are given in their grim reality. The critic must be wrong when he states that this fine psychological insight was unknown to French writers, for we have no more glaring example than the *Adolphe* of B. Constant, but he is careful to state that he had not imitated the Lake Poets of England. We regard this new awakening in the realm of letters as widespread, and not as confined to France alone—"encore J. Delorme n'est-il nullement leur imitateur; seulement il est, comme eux (i.e. the Lake Poets), dans le système individuel." Great praise is bestowed on his individuality, but he seems to us to become so egoistic that he becomes incomprehensible; he thus goes beyond the sphere of art, and, what is more, the sphere of reality. These poems have not, then, reached the highest point of personal inspiration. The critic thinks that the only resemblance between Hugo and Sainte-Beuve is their symbolism, and no greater tribute can be paid to these poets than that of originality. These words of the critic support our statement that they were only in agreement on certain general principles, while they each followed their own natural bent. Our attention is drawn to the fact that Sainte-Beuve has stamped the French language with the impress of his own genius; the modern poets, almost without exception, did the same, but they were rigid in their observance of the rules of French Grammar. Any breach of this rule is sympathetically attributed to the youthfulness of the

poets themselves. The position of the *Globe* is thus neatly summed up, "ce qu'il est utile de déferer au public, ce sont les torts volontaires et qui paraissent découler d'un système"; no sympathy whatever is wasted on literary coteries. The versification, according to the critic, belongs as much to the school of André Chénier as to that of Hugo. We have already shewn the incompatibility of these two authors, but we will confine our remarks to the versification of both, as the crux of the question lies therein. Chénier followed up the efforts of Ronsard, but, after all, his versification is purely classical; this is so because he did not realise his system by a direct study of French poetry, but he introduced the peculiarities of the classical models into French verse. His dislocation of the verse is simply analogous to the method of the Romanticists; he tried the Pindaric Ode with some success. The one main source of objection to the Tendency is to be found in the following words, "ici, comme en tout, l'auteur pêche quelquefois *par excès*"; another fault seems to be their weakness for "la difficulté vaincue." Surely they cannot be justly accused of unearthing old metres simply for the love of the past; this charge is incorrect, because they required new forms to express the new aspirations with which they were inspired. To compare them with "l'Abbé Delille" is puerile.

Aug. 15th, 1829. *J. Delorme.*

The words, "nul doute alors que ces vieilleries si vivement combattues par vous ne soient hors de question," shew us that people regarded the *Globe* as out of sympathy with the past, and, in the light of these words, the correspondent naturally repudiates the connection said to exist between André Chénier and the modern poets. The writer continues thus, "si j'ai bonne mémoire, quelque part même vous avez dit que M. Hugo avait le génie du style, compliment dont il s'est, dit-on,

défendu, mais qui, dans tous les cas, ne prouve pas que vous soyez au nombre de ses détracteurs." It must be borne in mind that we have never once called the *Globe* a detractor of Hugo, but we did state that it judged him, like every other author, on his merits. Hugo stood manfully by *La Muse Française*, because it upheld what was dear to him, and, this being the case, may we not surmise that he refused a title from the *Globe*, because he did not reckon it as belonging to his literary coterie? We call especial attention to the following words. "Il est vrai qu'en même temps vous avez reproché à l'école nouvelle cette imitation des vieux vers français qu'elle prend pour d'originalité; vous lui avez demandé si, moins torturée, sa pensée n'arriverait pas plus nette et plus pure aux intelligences étrangères." Without entering into the pros and cons of this argument, we surely cannot call the *Globe* a Romantic organ, when it disagrees with what were, for good or evil, distinctive features of the Tendency. A purely Romantic journal would simply palliate all these points. "Que l'on l'aime ou non, l'école nouvelle mérite, je crois, une sérieuse attention, et par le talent de ses adeptes, et par l'influence qu'elle peut avoir sur les arts. Longtemps vous avez combattu pour la liberté, la liberté est acquise; il faut maintenant la suivre dans ses divers développements, il faut juger l'usage que depuis deux ans chacun en a fait." The *Globe* stood for the broad principle of liberty.

June 13th, 1829. *Les Chroniques de France*.
Madame Tastu. C... S.

We find a further definition of the position of this paper in the following words: "quelque affection que nous portions à ceux qui sont dans la lice, nous n'avons qu'à ouvrir les barrières et à juger des coups." The editors express their sympathy with the young poets in their struggle, but judge them from the point of view of art. Neither have they any sympathy for authors

who take their inspiration from the past; on the contrary, they counsel everyone to pay heed to personal inspiration, "il est si difficile de vivre des émotions du passé et d'étouffer les siennes."

Oct. 21st, 1829. *A. de Vigny.* C. Magnin.

The critic states that the young poets were pre-eminent in the realm of poetry, as the disappearance of the old traditions had left them a clear course; in fact, they invented several new *genres*. On the stage, however, where France had such a glorious past, the young authors had to break through a mass of rotten systems, and there was nothing so likely to damp their ardour as the fruitlessness of their efforts. The older critics applied their principles of dramatic art to modern productions, so that, according to the critic, the works of the younger generation were naturally non-suited. In spite of this disadvantage, De Vigny was more popular than he had been. The *Globe* had been, in the past, prejudiced against him on account of his barbarous style, but now it justly appreciates his talent; yet another testimony to the impartiality of its criticism. *Éloa* is, to our mind, a splendid conception, and it is no wonder to hear the critic speaking in terms of highest praise of the individuality displayed therein. We generally derive great pleasure from such works, but they fail from their want of reality. *Moïse* is, according to the critic, a poem of melancholy; we consider that it derives great strength from its modern conception, thus supplying the missing link in an old myth. Beyond this, it appeals more to the average man, in that it pictures the struggles of a person placed in the ordinary circumstances of life. Imaginative, yet real, it brings into prominence the best features of the Tendency. A few of the mannerisms of the author are quoted, but they are relatively unimportant, and do not call for so much attention.

Dec. 9th, 1829. *Divine Comedy*. (Translation.)
A. Deschamps.

We consider the following words of some interest, as shewing the connection between the *Globe* and the new order of poets. "Il n'y a vraiment aujourd'hui de vie et d'originalité que dans cette jeune pléiade de poètes qu'une amitié, trop intime pour être impartiale, a trop souvent exaltés outre mesure; mais qui, à côté de Lamartine, de Béranger et de C. Delavigne, soutiennent la gloire poétique de la France." The *Globe* deplores the lack of true criticism, and, reading between the lines, we infer that fair criticism is the *raison d'être* of its existence as a literary publication. Deschamps, according to the critic, is seen to best advantage in his descriptions of familiar scenes; we can trace this facility to his power of individual expression. The editors reiterate their position of independence, but they have decidedly modern leanings; the absence of these up-to-date aspirations would at once incapacitate them from doing their work properly. "Dans l'espèce de réaction qui menace Hugo et ses amis, nous ne capitulerons ni avec notre goût qui leur a souvent été sévère, ni avec les mauvaises passions de rivaux sans talent et sans audace qui se rangent derrière quelques critiques timides, adoreurs du passé. Notre rôle à nous est simple et franc en littérature comme en politique; *encourager toutes les tentatives*; soutenir et défendre le talent, même lorsqu'il s'égare, tout en signalant ses fautes et ses écarts; céder au goût national s'il est éclairé, le combattre et le braver s'il n'écoute que le préjugé. Avec cela, nous n'aurons besoin ni d'hymnes à nos vieilles gloires ni de théories réactionnaires. Si la jeune école poétique comprend son rôle, comme nous comprenons celui de la critique, elle fera elle-même justice de quelques-uns de ses défauts, trop aisés à surprendre pour qu'il ne soit pas aisé aussi de les corriger."

Jan. 6th, 1830. *Divine Comedy*. (Translation.)
Sautelet.

The question is asked why France had neglected Dante all too long; the critic remarks that France, situated at an equal distance from the North and the South, could not fully appreciate the works of either. This remark takes us back to Madame de Staël who stated that the Romantic Movement had spread from the North; Sismondi, however, introduced the influence of the Southern literatures. The latter is the more likely contingency, and both these views seem to strengthen the position of the critic. The geographical situation of the French people might possibly render them indifferent to true poetry, but their natural mobility of character was always a safeguard against this calamity. The passion for Middle Age subjects was entirely due to Romantic authors such as Hugo and Scott.

Jan. 20th, 1830. *The Elegy*. Guizot.

It was generally thought that Frenchmen were always gay, and never sorrowful, so that the elegy, naturally a tearful production, was non-existent in France. All compositions, according to the critic, were tinged with melancholy, and, as this feature tended to become a system, it met with but scant sympathy in the columns of the *Globe*. "Et si fort aguerri que l'on puisse être contre la mélancolie, il est difficile de se soustraire à la contagion." We consider that this is a feature worthy of our admiration, though at times it lacks reality. Generally speaking, the *Globe* took the following view: "il faut qu'elle emprunte au monde extérieur de quoi soutenir sa vigueur." The *Globe* stood for individual merit and not for a system. "Notre opposition au système élégiaque ne nous rendra pas injustes envers les auteurs d'élégies." An appeal is made to all poets to dis-

card this system of melancholy and to produce healthy, vigorous poetry; the sole reason for this behest is that the whole subject had become nauseating.

April 30th, 1830. *Lamartine and the Academy.*
Sainte-Beuve.

We are given to understand that Lamartine, true to his meditative turn of mind, had left France for Italy, there to intensify this phase of his talent. All France, and the *Globe* included, was beginning to recognise the majesty of his genius. The critic admits that Lamartine, in spite of the differences between him and the other poets, continued the innovations of Chateaubriand. This admission regarding the differences proves that the *Globe* regarded this revolution as the union, on a broad basis, of a number of independent talents, and not as a composite school. No one could exactly foretell the final form which the Tendency was going to assume, because of its strong individualistic bias. Lamartine finds a word of praise for the Tendency, but he, like the *Globe*, favours the policy of the open door; every worthy talent should have admission to the Academy, *sans acceptation de système*. Six years previous to this all innovations were decried, but now Lamartine is welcomed with acclamation; *tempora mutantur, mutamur in illis*.

April 8th, 1830. *History of Poetry*, by Ampère.

The critic remarks that Ampère, unlike the older critics, considers every worthy production as a reflection of the society in which it was produced, thus giving expression to a view held by the *Globe*; strange to relate, it says nothing one way or another. Ampère states that all men regard the past in the light of the present, and describes the whole movement as *le même esprit, la même tendance partout*, not a school in the narrow sense of the term. He also states that every poet owes as much

to the national genius of his fatherland as to his own personal inspiration; here we perceive the union of the particular and the general which is necessary to a correct idea of individualism—a view which the *Globe* has upheld all along. The critic thinks that the religious impressions of a nation are of great value to literature, and this can be proved by reference to the works of Lamartine and Chateaubriand, where the religious element is strong. Exception is taken to the repeated use of mythological terms; this is but a reminder that the *Globe* would have nothing to do with the traditions of the past. The *Globe* prescribes the usual remedy, "c'est un des grands problèmes qu'ont maintenant à résoudre ceux qui aspirent chez nous à fonder une poésie nouvelle; *il leur faut créer une nouvelle langue de l'imagination; il leur faut, par la seule force de la pensée individuelle, produire brusquement ce qu'avait lentement formé l'imagination des siècles*"; the ideas of imagination and individuality are ever present. "Même chez les rénovateurs de l'art, on trouve souvent une forte empreinte du génie de leurs prédécesseurs ou de leurs contemporains." We are willing to accept the first portion of the statement with reference to the young poets, provided that the word *prédécesseurs* does not include the poets of the Classical Tradition; the influence of Rousseau, Chateaubriand, Madame de Staël, and others is quite palpable in their works. There is also no doubt that one living poet influenced another, just as Hugo affected Joseph Delorme; but for all that, each poet retained his individuality. Absolute originality is, as Ampère puts it, impossible, but the independence of the poet lies in his power of giving us his own impressions of things ("donner sa forme à la matière poétique que le temps a faite"). Speaking of the Middle Age poetry of Europe, the writer states that its origin and essence are the same; why not apply the same principle to this new Tendency which was, in a different manner, widespread in Europe? The individuality of

the great poet is, "il se crée un monde à son image"; not after anyone else's ideal. Herein, according to Ampère, lies the danger; the Muse may go beyond the sphere of human influence; so he counsels every poet to follow Nature as she is reflected in himself. Ampère would have strengthened his case had he stated that the poet who goes far beyond the limit of human experience is not lyric and personal. Every critic is urged to have such a thorough knowledge of the poet's character and surroundings, that he can judge his works thereby. This position is somewhat idealistic, as there are many poets whose lives would place them outside the pale of respectability, but who are exquisite artists. How many of us would undertake, for instance, to deduce Shakespeare's private opinions from his works? We are glad to find that Ampère pleads for an intimate knowledge of the poet, for, after all, it is *here* that the fount of all inspiration is to be discovered.

May 1st, 1830. *La Conversion d'un Romantique.*
M. Jay.

This work in itself does not call for much notice, but, amidst the many jocular remarks of the critic, there are a few statements which give the peculiar tenets of the Romanticists so called. "Se tuer par métaphore" is the epithet applied to J. Delorme, and in this we discover a sly hit at Hugo. Joseph Delorme is regarded as a madman, because "il fait des vers à césure mobile et ne jure que par Vigny et Hugo." M. Jay believes that he is uncomplimentary to the modern poets when he states, "Joseph ne vit pas entièrement des rayons du soleil ou du clair de lune"; if anything, this feature redounds to their credit, for it shews us that the best of them at least meditate, and yet derive pleasure and benefit from the society of their fellow-men. The critic aptly describes the unity of place as *un château démoli*;

the article ends up with a telling attack on the men who bring politics to bear upon literary criticism.

May 7th, 1830. *Consolations* of J. Delorme. Duvergier de Hauranne.

As we have previously remarked, the poems in their entirety are prompted by a feeling of sadness; Delorme was tired of everything. We like these poems because they are true, but if we read them too often they begin to pall on us. He is a representative of the Tendency; but he carries this principle of *aspirations inassouvies*, quite legitimate in itself, too far. His versification is so well known that it needs no comment; we pass on to consider the critic's remarks. The *Globe* once more explicitly lays down its policy: "Car si la petite église poétique à laquelle fait profession d'appartenir l'auteur des *Consolations*, a d'extravagants sectateurs, elle a des ennemis qui ne sont guère plus sages. Mais, au milieu, se trouve un public impartial et sincère qui, sans fermer les yeux sur les défauts, ne demandent qu'à goûter les beautés, public jeune en général et que n'égarent ni de vieux ni de nouveaux préjugés. C'est à ce public que nous essaierons de parler." More praise is bestowed upon the Romanticists than upon the Pseudo-Classicists; the reason for this is that their productions are the only ones worthy of the name. The reader must, according to the critic, himself meditate in order to understand an individualistic poem; this seems to us to be an unfailing test of personal inspiration. The influence of religion is manifested in the case of Sainte-Beuve, as it turned his scepticism into mysticism; we would, however, remark that its influence on Chateaubriand and Lamartine was much more pronounced. The critic perceives the indefiniteness of the ideas of the poems, and states that it was the prevalent fashion, but he does not attempt to explain it. The young men of the age were, without a doubt,

conscious of their needs, as the past had left them without any ideals. Sainte-Beuve is congratulated for having so closely identified himself with his poem; and further, the poem finds favour because it is so true. The critic says nothing about its reasonableness; it depends whether the individuality of the poet has descended to egoism or not. The poet's descriptions of commonplace things are fine, and in this particular he is only carrying out a feature of the Tendency. "Faut-il cent fois répéter que la poésie est partout où il existe un poète et là seulement?" The *Globe* clearly does not lay stress on any particular doctrines. The critic states that he possesses two styles, one of his own, and another belonging to what he calls the Romantic School. We think that Sainte-Beuve was not quite at home in the realm of poetry, but he was, for all that, an excellent critic. He had changed his opinions so often that we should hesitate even to attach him to any fixed doctrine, in the matter of style or anything else. Again, there is really no difference of style; he is himself all through. His real bent did not get full scope in poetry, and he was, on the whole, inferior to Hugo, who combined the faculties of poetry and criticism. The *Globe* does not regard the modern poets as a composite school, but states definitely that they form an independent concern. Reference is made to recasting the language; there existed, to our mind, a new inspiration, and so it was absolutely necessary to have a means of adequately expressing this inspiration. This was a delicate matter to handle, but it could well be left to the individual author to decide; it was patent that the old forms were not suited to these new ideals. The *Globe* blames the young poets for having some strange words, which it calls *cocardes*. Others blamed them for having the same weaknesses, but these faults differed widely in each case. Sainte-Beuve was quite unlike Hugo, who possessed the gift of imagination and no great powers of thought.

Feb. 17th, 1830. *Contes d'Espagne et d'Italie* of Musset.
Duvergier de Hauranne.

The poems treated here are only his youthful productions, and they should be judged as such.

"Surtout, considérez, illustres seigneuries,
Comme l'auteur est jeune et c'est son premier pas."

We are struck with the complete absence of any moral idea in the poems, but this is not surprising, as he, like Byron, expresses the feelings of a passionate youth. He is sometimes accused of following Byron; he may have taken some of his sentiments, but he placed the impress of his own genius upon his works; they are purely artistic, and we have no right to go further in this particular case. De Musset repudiates this charge in his usual nonchalant way:

"Byron, me direz-vous, m'a servi de modèle;
Vous ne savez pas donc qu'il imitait Pulci."
(*Namouna*, v. 8.)

We may well class him among the poets of the Tendency, because his poems, however light they may be, give us his own impressions of things, "le vrai seul est ma loi" (*Namouna*, v. 30). The fact that he started his literary career in 1830 is bound to have had some influence on his talent, and, besides this, the title of the volume places him, without further consideration, in the same category. He seems to have entered into the Romantic Tendency more by force of circumstances than by anything else; he was, without a doubt, an eccentric character, and, in spite of all his weakness, he possessed a strength which was almost inexplicable. As he was purely artistic, it is no wonder that he was the first to introduce *le dandysme* into French literature, a feature which is inseparable from his name. He did not much care for the distinc-

tive features of the Tendency; he treated the whole matter as lightly as possible.

"J'ai fait un hiatus, indigne de pardon."

(*Namouna*, verse 61.)

"Diable! J'ai du malheur! Encore un barbarisme!"

The critic states that De Musset personified a revolution which went further than that of Hugo. This view of the matter is somewhat of an exaggeration, as Musset followed these features simply because they happened to suit his fancy. The poem entitled *Portia* is not unconventional enough; it seems to us to have been inspired by Byron; however, we regard it as a case of *un cerveau malade*, the worst feature of the modern poets. De Musset himself does not regard *Ballade à la Lune* as anything but a parody of the Romantic Poetry. The critic, though deploring the absence of some moral idea, does not desire a work of art to have a moral aim; we can excuse this so-called absence of moral ideas by stating that De Musset was purely an artist. The critic's opinion is that De Musset, by getting as far away as possible from the old manner of keeping *le laid* and *le beau* apart, unconsciously returns to it. We would, however, state that he followed some of the Romanticists in giving undue prominence to *le laid*, with a view of contrasting it with *le beau*, and did not keep the two elements apart. It would be unjust to say that De Musset had no regard for the beautiful. Who can read *Les Confessions d'un Enfant du Siècle* without feeling that he had at last come to realise the nobility of character of Madame Pierson? It is *par espièglerie* that he is so very unconventional. Chantavoine (Petit de Julleville, *Hist. de la Litt. Fr.*, Vol. VII. p. 328) quotes the following words of De Musset: "Je ne comprends pas que, pour faire un vers, on s'amuse à commencer par la fin, en remontant le courant, tant bien que mal, de la dernière syllabe à la première, autrement dit

de la rime à la raison, au lieu de descendre naturellement de la pensée à la rime ; ce sont là des jeux d'esprit avec lesquels on s'accoutume à voir dans les mots autre chose que le symbole des idées." Though purely Romantic in his earlier works, his return to the Classical models was due, judging from the above words, to his natural temperament. The critic praises him for not following the modern poets in their long descriptions. The term *code romantique*, which the *Globe* introduces at this stage, must be taken in a restricted sense ; in no wise must it be taken to represent a definite school of poetry, for De Musset is judged solely on his merits. This opinion is further supported by the statement that De Musset was more like Mérimée than Hugo ; clearly the *Globe* admits that there are differences amongst these authors ; we can then safely state that the editors admitted the existence of some general movement, but no fixed system of poetry. The word *code* then is quite inadequate to describe the Tendency. The critic remarks that *Portia* has some analogy with the *Parisina* of Byron. Byron's poem offers a *dénouement* which is a moral lesson, but Musset, though taking up the same idea of a secret passion, did not treat it so seriously ; the *Globe*, as usual, gives him credit for his originality. The poems *Mardoche* and *Marrons du Feu* clearly shew that De Musset was at times capable of lofty inspiration, but he often displays a vein of coarseness which spoils all the previous effects. The critic justly calls attention to the unnaturalness of *Les Marrons du Feu*, but at the same time, we must be careful to distinguish between the moral sense of De Musset and that of the other modern poets. The *Globe* thinks that he has successfully imitated Byron, Mérimée, and Hugo ; we have already shewn wherein he differs from Byron. He is not simple enough to be a Mérimée, who possesses the supreme gift of *multum in parvo*. His versification is not so masterful as Hugo's, neither is his inspiration so personal and real. Musset, according to the *Globe*, followed his personal inspiration ;

we agree with this view if the critic regards the flippant manner as a trait in his character. It is beside the mark to state that De Musset sought after *le laid*, but he only did so, like many others, to bring *le beau* into greater prominence. However, we consider that this proceeding retards the progress of true art, but it is always just to impute right motives wherever that is possible. The *Globe* is careful to admit that the volume redounded to the credit of such a young author; his faults served as a warning to others not to go too far. "L'école nouvelle a sans doute ses défauts; nous les avons signalés et les signalerons encore. Quant à l'école ennemie, elle n'en a qu'un, mais il est grave; elle est morte."

— May 31st, 1830. *Poésies*, by Madame Valmore.
Barraut (?).

The critic remarks that individual poetry was impossible in the 17th and 18th centuries, because society was a composite whole which could not be dissolved with impunity, but in the 19th century men followed up their personal inspiration. Madame Valmore is praised for giving us her own feelings; they were sometimes carried to excess. Her idylls, especially "L'Adieu du Soir" (*Œuvres*, p. 6), are simple yet true. She had passed through terrible trials, and they seem to have broken her spirit. She was the poet of simplicity; when this one idea was exhausted she fell back upon an inspiration which did not really exist. She tried to overcome this by artistic productions—the feature of *la difficulté vaincue*, so common among the modern poets. We do not agree with the critic where he states that she copied the weakness of Lamartine, for she composed her poems before his appearance; thus it was a case of two persons having the same faults without collusion.

June 11th, 16th, 20th, 1830. *Harmonies*, by Lamartine.
Sainte-Beuve.

The initial success of these poems was due to the fact that they expressed the aspirations of the age. The religious inspiration, so characteristic of some of the modern poets, is undiminished. The personal element, so intimately bound up with melancholy that the poet seems to dwell in regions far away from ours, is much in evidence. These are the reasons advanced by the *Globe* to account for their popularity. The theme of Love, as expressed by Lamartine, was, according to the critic, not a living thing because it belonged to the past; we would point out that the central idea of his poems was "religion"; in fact, all other themes were subservient to this one thought. His meditation is not on the sorrows of the world, but on higher things. The *Idée de Jéhovah* is, as we are aptly told, the confession of a sincere believer, and this, from one point of view, fulfils one of the conditions of individuality. History tells us that a roaming spirit of doubt pervaded all classes of society; Lamartine, by expressing his own ideas to the detriment of these general impressions, seemed to revert to one of his old faults; after all, the theme which he treats is too abstract for us to lay down a strict philosophical definition. We would not, as Sainte-Beuve does, attribute the prevailing note of sadness of the poems to any doubts, but we prefer to regard Lamartine as losing sympathy with the material world, and thereby failing to appreciate its beauties. In the poem *Novissima Verba* we discover some of the best features of the Tendency; it is a vivid, rapid description of the changeableness of life. The position of the *Globe* is once more clearly stated, "l'originalité des grands poètes, on le sait, consiste surtout à voir et à exprimer la vie et les hommes par un côté intime et nouveau." Christianity had its poets, and they were a prominent feature of the Tendency. There were many, states the critic, who were

imbued with these religious impressions and with that mysticism. It seems to us that Lamartine shewed the way to these scattered units. We confess to have failed to follow him in his poem *L'Occident* because of its intense imagination. The critic states, and with some truth, that this poem was after the manner of Hugo, but we think that Lamartine's fault is due to a mystical turn of mind, and not to his love of *le grandiose*. Hugo affected this manner because he desired to be different from everyone else; it was a studied move on his part. The *Globe* regards the two poets as independent, but acknowledges that they resemble one another in certain general principles—"Cette pièce grandiose est doublement à remarquer, comme admirable d'abord et en ce qu'elle prouve une certaine confusion de limites dans les talents naturels des deux poètes." He is already well known as a painter of country scenery. The critic touches lightly on his *nonchalance*, which is both his charm and his bane.

Nov. 1st, 1830. *Poésies* of T. Gautier. F.

Gautier was in close communication with the Romantics so called, as can be seen from his *Histoire du Romantisme*. His exploits at the first representation of *Hernani* also point to this fact. As he was a painter, it was the dazzling images of the modern poems which appealed to him; this was, perhaps, one of the reasons why he did not favour them longer than he did. He does not express great ideas; form is his sole consideration; thanks to this gift he has established a following, known as *l'école plastique*. The critic refutes the general impression that the Restoration had swamped all the young poets, for Gautier is quoted as an example to the contrary, and is also classified with the other modern poets. The *Globe* had its misgivings as to whether it was advisable for these poets to risk publication in such a troublesome time; it would not have given this advice a little earlier

in the day. The critic recognises that the poems are fine as regards their form, but he deplores the lack of inspiration, a failing which he attributes to the poet's anxiety for the versification. These poems were, at best, but a feeble echo of the modern masterpieces; now there was need of real talent, and mere dabblers in poetry were too numerous.

Nov. 4th, 1830. *Poésies et Pensées* of J. Delorme. Sainte-Beuve himself wrote this (see letters to Hugo).

Le mal du siècle, which is so inseparable from the works of Joseph Delorme, is described at some length; the only important feature for us at the present juncture is that the *Globe* mentions the names of those who were suffering from this complaint, and thus acknowledges its wide existence. It quotes Goethe (*Werther*), Chateaubriand (*René*), Byron, B. Constant (*Adolphe*), Lamartine (*Elvire*); of course, fault is found with this excessive meditation. Sainte-Beuve seems to have found relief in the company of friends, and this gives the *Globe* the opportunity of attacking the nauseating individuality, and the criticism which arises therefrom; the critic, however, stands firm for strict individuality of talent. Speaking of this criticism, he says, "la critique moqueuse de notre époque s'est égayée là-dessus; cette critique pousse de toutes ses forces à l'individualisme, croyant produire ainsi l'originalité, et elle ne peut apercevoir la moindre apparence d'association et de lien sans tâcher malicieusement de les ronger, de les dissoudre"; it is against this excess that the struggle has been carried on. This coterie is opposed by the *Globe*, because it is too narrow, and because it has not much connection with the outside world. We are given the reason for the failure of these meditative poems, "l'association romantique, formulée par la restauration, était trop restreinte elle-même, trop artificielle et trop peu mêlée au mouvement profond de la société." The suggestion that the

poets could apply the term *école* to their union, which was but a slight one, is dismissed at once: "le cénacle n'était après tout qu'un salon." The critic congratulates Hugo and Vigny upon entering on a new lease of life, and the reason adduced for this is that they have left their old ground; these are, surely, not the words of a Romantic organ.

May 9th, 1831. *L'Élévation*. De Vigny.

The subject of the poem is a view of Paris, but De Vigny describes it from the point of view of a materialistic philosopher and not with the poetic genius of a Hugo. The critic cannot understand why poets, who sigh after some unattainable ideal, are not satisfied with the consolation offered by religion. We draw especial attention to this passage as the *first* instance in which the *Globe* makes a *sine qua non* of true poetry. Previous to this, it had always welcomed religious inspiration as tending to elevate literature; this positive declaration, so novel in the columns of the paper, can be attributed to the doctrines of Saint-Simon. De Vigny is quoted as the most religious poet of modern times, but, to our mind, he is a pessimist of the deepest dye. He did, in the first instance, derive his inspiration from Christian mysticism, and later on became a sceptic. Here again an opportunity is afforded the writer of regarding this new religion as the only means of producing a new literature.

June 17th, 1831. *La Némesis*. Barthélemy and Méry.

We conclude that our critic was a keen observer of events, because he states that materialism was the prevailing factor in the intellectual life of France at this time. It was hardly a propitious moment for a poet to publish a volume of poetry, but we think that, even amidst the hurry of the world, a few of the old lofty

ideals were likely to influence the best minds of the age. The critic states that the poets, amidst the stirring events of the time, having no theme to sing of, fell back upon themselves and, overwhelmed by the void in their own souls, became melancholy. This was not so much the reason as the fact that it was the tendency of the age, and that these poets came within its sphere of influence. The basis of all poetry, according to the *Globe*, was to be found in the words *si j'étais*; this seems doubtful to us, because the one feature of modern poetry was the just expression of the ideals of the times. These words may possibly be applied to those poets whose meditation was excessive, but after all they were unpopular, because they could not be understood. The critic has nothing but praise to bestow upon poetry which is inspired by the stirring events of the period. He goes beyond the sphere of art when he upholds militant, party poetry; this feature makes one deplore the change which the *Globe* had recently undergone. This paper never expressed any sympathy with those whose poetry was the evangel of despair, and this is the key-note of its criticism upon Barthélemy.

Aug. 6th, 1831. *Œuvres* of Farcy.

Farcy is acclaimed as a poet who was possessed of ideals in a barren age. He led a solitary life at Paris, but soon became glad of congenial company. It is quite probable that these solitary lives accounted for the unhealthy egoism which pervaded the works of modern authors. On the other hand, society did not destroy individuality; if anything, it tended to make the poet, so to speak, more human. We are told that Farcy, finding no inspiration in France, went elsewhere to acquire it, but returned as sad as ever. This instance inclines one to the belief that melancholy was inseparable from the individual and the age. The ideal for the poet was, "il voulait vivre de la vie de tous; si, un jour, au

milieu de la solitude, il vient à entendre quelque sourde rumeur comme la voix du peuple qui gronde." If the poets were to succeed, they must have personal inspiration and a knowledge of the world; they must be able to stamp their own genius upon the aspirations of the age. Sainte-Beuve, speaking of Farcy, remarks, "loyal, solitaire, indépendant, ne jurant par aucun parti, s'engouant peu pour tel ou tel personnage." He regards a modern poet as an independent genius; no mention is made of any school of thought; there was then no reason for calling the *Globe* a Romantic organ. The poets were loyal to one another as friends, and not as members of a coterie. Sainte-Beuve has, generally speaking, judged the Romantic Movement in a strange manner; there is, to our mind, one feature which has been overlooked. However much we may scout the idea of a literary coterie, we must admit that all these poets were linked together by certain general principles, especially the need for a purely modern, as opposed to a traditional inspiration. Sainte-Beuve surmises what the future of Farcy would have been, had he been blessed with a longer life. Becoming quite a Stoic, he would have fallen back upon solitary meditation, and would have considered the problems of practical life beneath notice; he would thus have gravitated to the position which Lamartine occupied. This was not the time, according to the critic, for solitude; it was the time for action. If poets had followed this behest too closely, true poetry would have been at a discount. They are urged to take a wider outlook than their own country, and consider that a too lengthy self-contemplation ends in the debasement of true genius. The *Globe* will not restrict literature in any manner whatsoever, "il fait mal de voir tant de brillantes imaginations de poètes s'obscurcir dans des créations dont l'influence ou la popularité ne peut dépasser les limites d'une coterie ou d'un salon."

Dec. 21st, 1831. *Saynètes.* P. Foucher.

The critic opens the article by regarding the poet as romantic, and this affords him the opportunity of making a few remarks on the characteristics of these authors. The first fault brought to our notice is "l'exagération et la prétention au vrai et au naturel." The *Globe* itself was very keen on naturalness and truth in all things. The modern poets, generally speaking, went further than this, because of their florid imaginations, and the *Globe* is only following its original criticism when it blames this exaggeration. The second fault is the following, "l'amour exclusif et la peinture minutieuse des costumes et des hommes, enfin un caprice desordonné pour les formes gothiques et les souvenirs catholiques et féodaux du moyen âge." It seems to us a distinct advantage to be able to describe men and their customs, and the failure of the Pseudo-Classicists can be attributed to the lack of descriptive power, especially in the case of their own age. Their fondness for the Middle Ages cannot be called inordinate; the best of them explained the past in the light of the present, and the *renaissance* of historical studies goes far to prove that the past was treated as it should be in a modern period. Who would think of rejecting the works of Scott as too musty, and who would stigmatise Hugo, with all his faults, as a blind partisan of the old traditions? The *raison-d'être* of these poets was that they had abjured all these systems. The remarks of the critic are, generally speaking, sweeping, though we admit that they are justifiable in the case of those who lived on imitation; these authors are not, however, the representatives of the modern era. The *Globe* sums up its criticism as follows, "mais à cela, et il serait injuste de le méconnaître, se joignent cependant un ardent désir d'avenir, une espérance, quoique vague et mal définie, d'une poésie plus féconde, plus haute, plus puissante que celle qu'il abjure et repousse." These poets who look into the future with vague hopes do not appeal to

the matter-of-fact critic. "Seulement son erreur qu'il partage au reste avec tous les adeptes de l'école romantique, est de croire arriver à cette littérature nouvelle en se plongeant dans le passé ; de croire que c'est en tenant la tête tournée avec regret et désir vers cet âge mort et stérile, qu'il aura des inspirations d'avenir, et qu'en évoquant des morts et remuant des cendres, il trouvera la vie"; the critic has taken a strange view of the situation. The poets did not look into the past with feelings of regret ; if such was the case, why should the same critic praise them for looking forward ? They were entirely modern, and it was the idea that the past was being misjudged that directed their attention towards it. They rehabilitated the past from the standpoint of modern ideals, and if anyone believes that there was any unreality in these productions, we would refer him to such a work as *Notre Dame de Paris*. If this does not suffice, we would call attention to the books on French History. This movement was, according to the critic, largely destructive ; its works are characterised as "des essais et des théories, si l'on peut appeler de ce nom ce qui n'est pas ordonné, ce qui manque de vue d'ensemble." The *Globe* then regards the revolution as a pure tendency with certain general characteristics, but in no wise to be regarded as a school. Hugo and A. Dumas are said to have influenced Foucher, but there is no servile imitation ; it must have been the influence of a great talent permeating all the contemporary poems. This feature does not do away with the originality of Foucher, who was thoroughly independent ; he certainly has succeeded in impressing his personality upon his work. The Théodore of *La Fatalité* is a second Joseph Delorme, and perhaps the poet is describing himself. Neither is the theme of love debased by the poet, but it serves to intensify his dramatic instinct.

Feb. 9th, 1832. Poems of E. Arago. C.

The advice given by the critic to his young friend is rather interesting. "Choisis d'abord dans tous les genres celui qui s'adapte le mieux à ta nature, à tes habitudes ; parler des choses dont l'essence nous est intimement connue, est le seul moyen d'être vrai. L'habileté du poète consiste à ne se point créer d'illusion sur son aptitude, à se choisir dans l'ensemble des êtres une part modeste et qui ne dépasse point ses forces, à creuser et remuer son domaine, à s'y rendre maître absolu ; ainsi il parvient à faire jaillir les étincelles poétiques que tout sujet plus ou moins profondément recèle en son sein. Ce n'est point la grande surface du terrain qui pour le poète est la richesse." The critic implies that, as a result of deep meditation, the poet must come to know his own powers ; once more he pleads for a personal poetry, and regards *la vérité* as consequent upon this. The *Globe*, when it remarks that it is impossible for a poet to be inspired if he is not acquainted with his theme, refers indirectly to some of the modern poets who sang of things which they had never seen. Hugo had done this in the *Orientales*, and the result was that they were not generally understood.

Feb. 13th, 1832. *Feuilles d'Automne*. Hugo.
X. Joncières.

Hugo was a great poet, but his earlier poems were vitiated by excessive imagination. He was too fond of overdoing his power as a versifier ; he coined words which neither he himself nor anyone else knew ; in short an otherwise great talent was spoilt by mannerisms. We attribute all these faults to his youthful ardour, but he certainly displays a somewhat chastened spirit in *Les Feuilles d'Automne*. This volume appeared in stirring times, when everyone was engrossed in the fate of *la patrie*. People hardly paid any heed to poetry, but it

was almost a certainty that poems worthy of the name were the result of deep meditation. Hugo does not sing of the pressing questions of the day, but gives a glimpse of his home life ; he sings of subjects which concern the welfare of the soul. His tone is not so loud ; he has imagination enough, but it is more restricted. These simple themes demand a simpler vocabulary ; they represent Hugo as having left the exuberance of youth. A reference is made to the prevalent practice of going to the East or elsewhere for inspiration. The critic tells us that the *Feuilles d'Automne* were composed when Hugo was surfeited with his imaginary peregrinations to the East. Hugo displays to great advantage his undoubted gift of dealing with young and old people ; a feature which, strange to say, the critic has not even mentioned ; what is more, the inspiration is eminently personal. The *Globe* did not view with equanimity the egoism which was then in vogue. "Et cependant dans cette poésie tout individuelle, éclate souvent un sentiment profond des maux de l'humanité, dans cette poésie toute d'intérieur il y a une larme pour les souffrances du monde, un soupir pour les consolations." True individuality, according to the *Globe*, is to express the aspirations of the age in one's own way. Our attention is called to the undoubted note of sadness which permeates these poems ; Joseph Delorme strikes the same note in his works ; we can make a general statement to the effect that it is a feature of the age. "Nous ne voulons pas sacrifier la personnalité au socialisme, pas plus que ce dernier à la personnalité. L'harmonisation de ces deux faces de la vie de l'homme est le but de tous nos efforts." The *Globe* is in favour of individuality, but it must not descend to purely personal interest. The way to escape from such a calamity is to keep in touch with the movements of the world around.

Feb. 19th, 1832. Poems of V. Escousse. X. Joncières.

Escousse started life with the promise of a glorious future, but these hopes were dashed to the ground by some unwise critics. He, like Delorme, gave up all hope, and abandoned himself to the prevalent sadness of the times. His own words sum up the position of the young poets, "j'éprouve un sensible plaisir dans mon isolement," and then follows a tribute to the unbiassed criticism of the *Globe*, "et à voir que votre journal n'ait pas eu de méchantes épigrammes pour un jeune homme à peine âgé de 20 ans, mais qu'il lui ait donné de salutaires conseils." We perceive from these words that their criticism did not consist of blind praise of the Romantic School, but that it was free and not entirely destructive.

CHAPTER VI.

THE *GLOBE* AND CRITICISM.

Sept. 15th, 1824. (Quoted page 4.)

AMIDST the preeminent success of all other branches of literature, criticism was in a state of decadence. Political journals eschewed it entirely, because they had more urgent matters to deal with, and, if they did criticise at all, it was in the interests of a party. The avowed literary organs were not worthy of the name, and the *Globe* has reason to complain that nothing was written to meet the aspirations of the rising generation. Criticism was in the hands of the coteries ; the result was that it could not be disinterested. Modern authors who struck an original line were neglected, and many a noble talent was lost to literature through want of appreciation. The *Globe* promises to examine works which are the outcome of modern inspiration ; however, productions which do not affect the evolution of letters will be left alone. It will support no school, but its views will be independent. The editors will not seek shelter behind the names of any authorities, and the columns will be open to all alike.

Nov. 2nd, 1824. *Le Journal du Commerce*.

The editors quote the following words, to be found in *Le Journal du Commerce*, which made its appearance, for the first time, a month previous to this date. " Il

paraît depuis un mois à Paris un nouveau journal littéraire publié les mardi, jeudi et samedi ; c'est le titre du nouveau venu, d'un format un peu plus grand que ses confrères, *Le Diable Boiteux*, et *La Pandore* ; il a, du moins, le mérite de l'originalité, qualité rare aujourd'hui. Son ton est plus grave que celui de ses amis, et il paraît avoir adopté en littérature les principes de l'école appelée romantique. Cependant il a prétention de ne s'être enrôlé sous aucune bannière et de n'appartenir à aucune coterie. Il faut convenir que jusqu'ici il a montré assez d'indépendance." This compliment is all the more welcome, because it seems to emanate from persons who possessed a keen insight into the state of French literature. The writer has expressed the prevalent opinion with regard to the connection between the *Globe* and the so-called Romantic School, but, to our mind, he attached no fixed meaning to the word *romantique* ; he has simply applied the term, in a general way, to all modern authors. He has taken notice of the *Globe's* claim to independence, and was forced to the conclusion that there was some ground for this avowal of neutrality with regard to the rival literary factions. This expression of opinion, coming, as it does, from an outside source, inclines us more than ever to the belief that the *Globe* was not the organ of any party, ancient or modern.

Nov. 30th, 1824. *Académie Française.*

The *Globe* tells us that the *Académie* had taken cognisance of the movement which was changing the trend of French thought. M. Auger is reported to have said, "ces amateurs de la belle nature qui, pour faire revivre la statue monstrueuse du saint Christophe, donneraient volontiers l'Apollon de Belvédère et, de grand cœur, échangeraient Phèdre et Iphigénie contre Faust et Goetz de Berlichingen." The *Globe* does not condemn this outburst as a supporter of the Tendency, but because it is a breach of the laws of good taste.

Jan. 22nd, 1825. *L'État de la Poésie Française.*
Rémusat.

The *Académie* initiated a discussion on the characteristics of poetic genius, and this article expresses the views of the *Globe* on the question. The critic sets forth his views as follows: "Il crée, c'est à dire qu'il donne l'être à des sentiments, à des objets, à des hommes imaginaires; qu'en un mot, il reproduit la nature après l'avoir contemplée, et rivalise avec elle en l'imitant. Il juge, c'est à dire qu'il observe encore la nature, et réfléchit sur ses observations, pour expliquer les causes et reconnaître les lois. Il fait sentir, ou il fait penser; il est donc poétique ou critique; tous les genres intermédiaires ne sont que des mélanges divers de critique et de poésie, de jugement et d'invention." The opinion here expressed is, perhaps, too general; a *littérateur* must compose or criticise, but surely he can "create" in other branches of literature besides the two mentioned above. We fail to see that there is any essential distinction between the different *genres*; modern authors did not confine their attention to poetry. Inspiration, according to the critic, is not a false enthusiasm which causes the poet to soar aloft, and commune with the creatures of his imagination; it is much simpler, "l'inspiration est quelque chose de plus simple et de plus universel." We have thus a clue to the position of the *Globe*, when it deplores the excesses of the authors, particularly as regards contemplative poetry. A poet can possess personal inspiration, and yet express himself in simple language; he is really not personal, unless he can voice the aspirations of the age in his own words. It is in this particular that Lamartine and other poets of that ilk failed. "L'inspiration, c'est cette disposition, habituelle pour quelques-uns, accidentelle pour la plupart, où nous jettent nos sentiments et nos sensations, et qui devient comme un besoin de les exprimer et de les répandre." True inspiration arises from the inmost

depths of a man's soul; one cannot attain to it by following a system. The poet must, to our mind, be human, if he is to be lyric; lyricism is personal, in that it is both individual and general. The reason advanced by the critic seems to us to be most convincing, "le poète n'est pourtant pas hors de lui-même; car dans la crise, que deviendrait la liberté d'esprit nécessaire à l'art?" The *Globe* was thus very practical on such questions; this is the very reason why it did not agree with modern poets. The *Globe* begs the poet to give the recollections of the emotions felt at a certain period rather than the emotions themselves; all we can say is that many poets who trusted too much to their recollections became, at times, ludicrous. Hugo, in most of his poems dealing with Spain, reproduces emotions felt at an early age, and they will not bear comparison with the stern reality of the sentiments expressed, for instance, in the *Ode à la Colonne*. The *Globe* unwittingly plays into the hands of the supporters of the *nonchalance* of the young poets. The critic, however, does not lay down any fixed principle in the matter, because it would be inconsistent with his view of individualism; inspiration is, in his opinion, synonymous with *le naturel*—a statement which is true enough, when we consider that unnaturalness is contrary to all ideas of true genius. We come across numerous references to the principle of *la vérité*; "écrire sous l'influence d'une telle disposition, c'est être soi-même, c'est obéir à sa nature, et non pas faire un métier ni calculer un effet"; it is in this connection that we perceive the difference between the old and new tradition. Great praise is bestowed upon Delavigne for being natural in his *Messéniennes*; in the poem on *The Death of Byron* he is not so successful, because he does not know much about the subject. Modern poets, says the *Globe*, reproduced, and did not create, because they sought after an artificial emotion; it is, however, hardly fair to apply this remark to them, because their one achievement was to have severed

themselves from the cast-iron system of the past. Imitation was the bane of French literature, and the *Globe* would not recognise it, because its policy was freedom in every sphere, "car tout le monde sent que le talent ne peut être une tradition, qu'il recommence sans cesse, et ne se perpétue pas comme une doctrine." Reality alone will produce inspiration, and Nature is the source whence poets must derive it. The *Globe* offers this advice to all authors, "vivez et sentez-vous vivre; plongez-vous dans le monde, apprenez à connaître les hommes en les pratiquant; voyez les objets pour les peindre, au lieu de les chercher dans les tableaux. Votre imagination vous contemple sans votre insu; c'est la Muse que le ciel a mise dans votre sein. Ne redoutez point la vie active; le génie s'isole au milieu du monde. Sentez donc pour être vrais; soyez hommes avant d'être poètes." A poet can retain his individuality among the bustle of the world; in fact, this is the only place where it is possible. The *Globe* demands a human muse; it, however, pleads for the union of fact and imagination as *le beau idéal* of literature.

Jan. 27th, 1825. Opinion of the *London Magazine*.

We call attention to a letter signed "W." commenting on an article which had appeared in the *London Magazine*, dealing with the *Globe* and its tenets. The following is the opinion of the English contemporary, "les bons gens du *Globe* ont une gravité qu'on pourrait appeler puritaine. Ce sont des sectateurs fanatiques de la philosophie spiritualiste de Platon"; the writer is more correct when he refers to the *Globe* as rational. In its reply, the *Globe* proclaims its position of independence, "nous laissons à ceux de nos lecteurs qui désireront voir le portrait des deux clans, le soin de chercher le recueil qui le contient. Un peu de vérité partout, et nulle part la vérité entière, voilà sous quel point de vue nous aimons à considérer la nature humaine"; truth is their motto,

but this does not exclude sentiment and its kindred attributes. Though opposed to the old school, it displays no animosity, "les respectables amis du dernier siècle peuvent dormir en paix dans leur gloire et leurs souvenirs."

Feb. 12th, 1825. *L'État de la Poésie Française*. Rémusat.

This article is mostly given up to a consideration of the works of Casimir Delavigne. Like V. Hugo, he divides poetry into that which is epic, dramatic or lyric. The critic tells us that epic poetry had not yet appeared in France; 'tis true, there had been many attempts, but nearly all were dismal failures. This failing was soon made good by the appearance of the works of Hugo, particularly *Eviradnus*; dramatic art was, however, in a very low state. We see the poet himself, according to the critic, in lyric poetry, but nothing is said about the inordinate lyricism which was so rampant at the time. Such was the poetry *par excellence* of the age, "en reproduisant des émotions personnelles, elle satisfait à ce besoin du naturel et du vrai, goût dominant de l'époque; et par son caractère de généralité, douée de la rapidité vagabonde de la pensée et même de la rêverie, elle répond singulièrement à cette disposition de doute et de contemplation où nous jettent les doctrines et les événements du siècle." In the eyes of the critic, true poetry should reflect the aspirations of the age; the men of the time aspired to all that was true and natural; they loved meditation, even when it was tinged with vagueness. This dictum had been previously laid down by Madame de Staël, and the remarks of the *Globe* thereon shew its fitness to deal with literary questions. The *Globe* safeguards against eccentricity by coupling *l'infini et l'individu*; in fact, one is meaningless without the other. Delavigne is considered most promising, because he has not adopted any *genre*; the policy of the "open door" is the inherent right of every talent; restrictions of any description harm true genius. The

modern poets had to avoid imitation; this is simply another way of stating the old principle of breaking away from the traditions of the past. *Waterloo* was, states the critic, successful because it voiced the general impressions of men, but the *Songs of Greece* failed because they had no *vérité locale*. This phrase is synonymous with *la couleur locale*; this is no separate canon of literature, but it is based upon the principle of *la vérité*. Imagination is meant to supplement truth, and not to take its place.

March 12th, 1825. *L'État de la Poésie Française.*
Rémusat.

This article deals principally with Lamartine and his works. Has criticism any right to pass judgment on a poet like Lamartine, whose inspiration is so personal? The critic answers that he has the right to demand inspiration from every poet, and states further that he can assist him by expressing an opinion on the quality of the work. A true critic, in our opinion, makes it his duty to praise the good points, and criticise the weakness of an author. Criticism is not entirely destructive, because it is based upon reason. Lamartine, with his dreamy imagination, appeals to persons of that ilk; he is true to himself in a certain sense, but it is difficult to reconcile his genius with our ideal of individuality. The critic recognises the difficulty, but, after all, a morbid feeling of this kind is so unnatural that the critic feels bound, from the standpoint of reason, to criticise these particular poems. It is an open question whether Lamartine belonged to the Tendency or not, but there is no doubt that he is the very incarnation of the aspirations of the age; while making allowances for his many faults, we must recognise him as a modern poet. *Les Méditations*, according to the *Globe*, are inspired, because they express the sentiments of the poet. We would remark that Lamartine, by dint of

continual meditation, had become almost incapable of studied care especially in versification. The *Globe* deploras this from the point of view of art, but it is fair enough to attribute the fault to the right cause. "L'incorrection négligée ne donne plus de naturel depuis qu'une certaine école poétique l'a érigée en système." The *Globe* does not belong to this category, and this remark serves as an example of the manner in which it criticised the excesses of these poets. Lamartine is not, according to the *Globe*, a member of this school. The word *école* must then have a very indefinite meaning; though Lamartine is at one with the poets in certain accepted general principles, the *Globe* definitely states that there were acute differences between them. The critic draws a sharp distinction between Delavigne and Lamartine which we will only just mention. The former was eminently lyric, because he expressed the sentiments of his compatriots in his own unique manner; the latter expressed the opinions of an undoubtedly large class of society, but he was, to our mind, too highly inspired for the average man. Differences did actually exist, but talent would be *non est* if they ceased. Both poets are sincere; there we have one point of agreement. Both had definitely forsaken the past. If we examine the works of the Tendency, we are bound to meet with these two features. This is the ground upon which they all meet; so, for this reason, we are bound to disagree with the writer of this article, when he irrevocably separates these poets. We would, however, agree with him, where he deploras the absence of the practical element in the poems of Lamartine; strictly speaking, he was not an individualistic poet, because he did not conform to the philosophical ideal as laid down by Hegel.

March 31st, 1825. *Une critique.* Par S.

The writer is so impressed by the impoverished state of French literature that he advises all authors to pay no attention to the critics. This may be advisable, but literature was decaying simply owing to the lack of true, virile criticism. A poet who had not the influence of the Classical School behind him could not possibly make a name, because all the literary papers were in their hands; the *Globe* was established to counteract this enervating influence. A reference is made to a poet who, when but 17 years of age, by reason of his *hautes pensées et sentiments profonds*, struck an original line. This statement must refer to Hugo, who was born in 1802, and in 1819 was crowned at the *Jeux Floraux* of Toulouse. The critic advises the young poets to concentrate their energies on one branch of literature, for then and only then can their works be a living reality.

March 24th, 1825. *Le Romantisme.* Duvergier de Hauranne.

The belief is expressed that hardly two persons held the same opinion on this subject. We have already given the different views in our estimate of Romanticism, so that there is no need to traverse the same ground again. The critic reiterates the well-known fact that the Romanticists themselves differed widely; the names of Hugo and Stendhal are quoted in support of this view. The *Globe*, however, lays stress on the destructive side of their work; they had to destroy the passion for the hackneyed compositions of the past, and the goal of their ambition was *la vérité*. The objection taken to the Pseudo-Classicists is that they judged after certain models which were, not only out of date, but also detrimental to originality. We have already made a

distinction between the real Classical Authors and the Pseudo-Classicists; it is against the latter that the *Globe* protests for their misuse of the true Classical models. A glaring instance of this spirit is quoted; Soumet was despised, because his imitation of Aeschylus was too classical: while Picard, who was daring in his innovations, was welcomed with open arms. They were so inconsistent that they had no fixed position; then they cannot, says the *Globe*, upbraid the modern authors for having no fixed doctrine. The critic remarks that they, first of all, studied the state of society at a fixed time, and attempted to express its aspirations in their works; theirs was a living literature. They are given the following advice, "asservissement aux règles de la langue, indépendance pour tout le reste." We would call attention to the works of Hugo at this juncture; the rules of grammar are respected, but yet he goes his own way; we can safely make the same general statement about his *confrères*. In nearly all branches of literature freedom had made its presence felt, but pedantism still held sway on the stage. A play like the *Marie Stuart* of Lebrun is rejected because it mingles *la tragédie* and *la comédie*. The *tragédie historique* is regarded as the most important branch of the Tendency because it is consonant with the ideals of the age, but, unfortunately, this hope will never be fully realised. The *Globe* does not judge these matters from the point of view of the modern poets, but it has the true interests of literature at heart. "Déjà, dans les deux camps, les bons esprits paraissent s'entendre sur quelques points importants." The modern poets are advised to trust to their own efforts, and to take their inspiration from modern facts. This movement is regarded as a tendency pure and simple without a precise signification, "ce qu'on appelle le romantique doit triompher, soit sous ce nom, soit sous un autre, parce que là seulement il y a vie, activité, mouvement en avant." The critic supports the Romanticists in their desire to express the ideals of their time, but it also

advises them to evade all that is vague, and especially to avoid the servile imitation of foreign idiosyncrasies. The *Globe* thus is an independent journal with modern ideals.

April 2nd, 1825. *L'Indépendance en Matière de Goût.*
L. Vitet.

The *Globe* states that, in the 18th century, there was a vague, unexpressed desire for freedom in many walks of life, but that few people desired it in the realm of letters. We called attention to this movement in our consideration of Romanticism, and we traced its origin as far back as the 18th century. The critic favours this idea, and the individual character of this movement is illustrated by the efforts of Diderot against the rules which were hampering literature, but, strange to say, he does not mention Rousseau—the strongest link of the chain. The philosophical view of the movement is *l'indépendance en matière de goût*. The practical view of Romanticism is said to be more widespread; there are so many different interpretations thereof, and each party seeks the realisation of its own ideal. These authors are not entirely independent of one another; the connecting link is to be found in the negative part of their doctrine. They do not follow the models of the past, because they would, thereby, lose their individuality. Herein lies our objection to the use of the word *école*; the *Globe* could not possibly be a party organ, because there was no party in existence. The critic confirms our statement that the Tendency was not confined to France; it was the outcome of the needs of the times, so that it was impossible to confine it within the narrow limits of one state. After enumerating all the different shades of Romanticism, the critic closes his argument by suggesting that the different phases should be coupled with the year in which they, severally, made their appearance. He also acknowledges

the existence of some general principles, and states that the Tendency is non-existent apart from the philosophical idea. We narrow down the issue, if we say that the only bond of union was the desire to war against the rules. Classicism is regarded as an absurdity, and the modern poets, according to the critic, have no right to adhere to it. "If you allow authors to follow their own inclination, then you countenance the licence of such works as *Hans d'Islande*; if you make them follow the desires of the public, then you can never answer for the quality of the productions"; such are the remarks of some writers. The poet is, in some measure, dependent on the public, and the public upon the poet, so that an equitable authority does exist. There is no such thing in existence as unbridled liberty; this is the reason why the *Globe* is so severe upon the excesses of the young poets. The *Globe* does not attempt to lay down any rules for their future guidance, because it has no intention of placing any restriction on talent. Béranger is justly quoted as an example of this unfettered freedom; the critic failed to point out that Béranger was popular, because he sang of the nation's misfortunes in his own inimitable way; the theme was personal, but its garb was general. The *Globe's* advice to all is not to create a school, and expect all ages to follow the models set up. "Le romantisme n'est ni un parti ni une doctrine littéraire; c'est loi de la nécessité, la loi de tout ce qui passe, de tout ce qui change, la loi de toutes choses en ce monde." The *Globe*, however, does not mean to plead on its behalf, "nous ne nous mettrions pas en peine de plaider pour lui."

April 7th, 1825. *Racine et Shakespeare*. Stendhal.

Stendhal differentiates between the old and the new traditions as follows: "le romantisme est l'art de présenter aux peuples les œuvres littéraires qui, dans l'état actuel de

leurs habitudes et de leurs croyances, sont susceptibles de leur donner le plus de plaisir possible." The conclusion drawn by the *Globe* from these words is that all the great poets have been *romantique* in their time. Stendhal appears to us to be quite sound in his views, since he regards the state and beliefs of society as essential to personal inspiration. This will serve as a general principle, but we think that its value would be enhanced if more stress were laid on the modern bias of the Tendency. All masterpieces are *romantique* in a sense, but the word does not attain its full significance unless we couple it with the beginning of the 19th century. Stendhal, like Hugo, has scant sympathy with the unities of time and place. Speaking of the respective merits of tragedies in prose and verse, the *Globe* says, "placés donc entre le double écueil, ou de paraître approuver les hérésies de l'un, ou de mettre en doute l'autorité de l'autre, nous gardons prudemment le silence et laissons le vers alexandrin plaider sa cause lui-même." These remarks, though by no means of any moment in themselves, are important, as showing that the independence of the *Globe* extended even to the consideration of relatively unimportant details. Stendhal protests against the statement that the Romanticists were inspired with a hatred of the Classical models. The critic points out that they regarded the Classical writers as the true representatives of their age, and they demanded the same right for themselves. He asks why the public refused to acknowledge the national tragedy in prose, seeing that it was the pressing need of literature at the time. Stendhal's view is that playgoers judged every piece according to set rules, and not after their own lights. We may add that it was very difficult to leave the old rut of the stage, seeing that, as yet, the modern dramatists had no alternative to offer. The fact that nearly all the journals were supporters of the old *régime* largely contributed to this state of things; one of the objects of the *Globe* was to do away with this anomaly.

The critic mildly remonstrates with Stendhal for not having connected the past with the present. We would state that Romanticism was not a phenomenon which had suddenly appeared, but that it was a natural growth. We cannot follow the critic, where he blames the writer for having neglected to look into the future; the *Globe* does not usually erect a literary fabric for the use of future years, because it would be curtailing the individuality of the authors; but here it takes up the opposite view. It would be well nigh impossible for a poet, who lived in the midst of a great political struggle, not to touch politics; the *Globe* does not forbid this, but it will not allow any composition to serve as a party weapon. Taking the remarks of Stendhal as a whole, they may be said to have thrown new light on the position of the Tendency.

April 16th, 1825. *État de la Poésie Française.*
Rémusat.

The article deals especially with the works of Béranger. The *chanson* was often neglected as unworthy of attention, but Béranger so improved it that, at last, it occupied quite a respectable position. The critic regards the *chanson* as a *genre* which lends itself to real inspiration; this is a very reasonable view to take, as it almost invariably dealt with current events. It was also preeminently a feature of the Tendency, for it was sometimes composed under the influence of dream and imagination. Béranger is a purely personal poet, because he sings after a manner dear to the heart of the people. He has combined his own personal feelings and those of his age so well that they have become inseparable; this is true romanticism. The *Globe*, however, criticises where necessary, and, in this instance, it blames the vagueness of Béranger, but regards it as an attribute of his genius.

April 23rd, 1825. *L'Indépendance en matière de goût.*
L. Vitet.

Special reference is made to the intervention of the government in literature. A certain author, who was most probably Hugo, desired to produce a play at the *Comédie Française*, but his request was refused for the following reasons: "le gouvernement nous a institués pour jouer trois genres, la tragédie, la comédie et le drame. Votre ouvrage n'est ni un drame ni une comédie, ni une tragédie; nos règlements nous défendent donc de le représenter." The ruling powers thus stepped in, probably because it would not do for them to countenance liberty of any sort. Some lovers of freedom were desirous of establishing a rival theatre, but the government would not hear of it. The union of Classicism and the government was an accomplished fact. The *Globe* urged all the friends of liberty to secure the dissolution of this unholy alliance; liberty was an essential under a democratic *régime*.

May 17th, 1825. *Le Génie Poétique.* Artaud.

Artaud deals with the philosophical aspect of Romanticism; he then proceeds to enumerate its general characteristics. He quotes the influence of Nature upon the poets, and states that imagination must be a living force, before it can be regarded as inspired. We can simplify the statement by remarking that inspiration does not rest upon passion alone; truth and reality must be present to check it; it was this passion which led the modern poets astray. Artaud pleads for the union of poetry and Nature, but this does not, as he seems to think, produce an outward and an inward inspiration; true inspiration consists of the blending of both. He has further displayed great talent in his

careful analysis of the individualism of the 19th century. We would not, however, regard Byron as the only person who possessed this gift; every modern poet possessed it more or less. This meditative poetry is not, as M. Artaud thinks, merely particular; it cannot be personal unless it is general as well. A neat compliment is paid to Scott, who influenced the literature of many countries besides his own. The *Globe* expresses approval of these views, but it regrets that he did not show how men were to introduce innovations without eccentricity. We are given to understand that the supporters of the old traditions were modifying their views; we can then infer that the Tendency was growing apace.

May 21st, 1825. *Les Innovations Dramatiques*. Lemer cier.
Duvergier de Hauranne.

The *Globe* is strongly opposed to excesses of every description, no matter who the culprits are—"car, après tout, la fantasmagorie de l'antiquité ne nous paraît pas beaucoup plus dramatique que celle du moyen âge"; it demands a return to reality—"c'est le règne des réalités que nous appelons de tous nos vœux." The critic disapproves of Lemer cier's disdainful remarks on the German theatre, thus affording us yet another example of the tolerance of the *Globe*, even when dealing with the works of other countries. Lemer cier justly remarks that Romanticism cannot be rigidly defined. He had himself wavered between the two parties, and, however much he reviled the *Globe*, he had no truer friend, because it showed him his true position.

June 11th, 1825. *Le Classique et le Romantique*.
C. Desmarais. Duvergier de Hauranne.

According to the *Globe*, the critics looked upon the modern poets as madmen, but, now that Fortune was

smiling on them, they gave way to anger. The Classical organs were not so loud in their criticisms, and heresy had even reached the portals of the Academy, where Villemain was lecturing on literature. The destructive character of the Tendency had now well nigh gone, because Mérimée had produced his *Théâtre de Clara Gazul*. The critic states that the French Revolution had divided the modern poets into two factions; some were opposed to it, but others were not; the *Globe* does not then regard the Tendency as a composite whole, with well-defined limits. We must admit that the Revolution contributed largely to the evolution of the Tendency. The modern authors had joined hands to battle with the traditions of the past, but yet they differed on many points. They had united to destroy, but they were individualistic in their creations: "Il se trouve un côté gauche et un côté droit, unis contre le ventre, mais divisés sur tout le reste." Desmarais follows Chateaubriand in his weakness for mysticism, but the *Globe* is surprised to find that he has made no mention of dramatic art. It seems to us that the whole crux of the question lies here, because the struggle was for the realisation of the right of individual judgment. As Desmarais expressed the desire of consulting the Romantics, the *Globe* expected to see the names of Schiller, Manzoni, Sismondi, Stendhal, but it found instead those of Hugo and Guiraud. "Quant à nous qui pensons que, romantique ou classique, la première qualité est d'être intelligible, nous récusons l'autorité de ces messieurs." There was no necessity to ask whether the poet was romantic or not; it was far more important to demand clearness of style, a quality sadly lacking in these authors. Desmarais himself is blamed for his too frequent flights of imagination, and for his strange expressions.

July 9th, 1825. *Le Romantique*. J. J. Ampère.

Ampère begins by stating the difficulty of impartially criticising works which afford us pleasure; the division of *littérateurs* into two opposing factions is attributed to this cause. The *Globe* is eclectic in that it claims the privilege of having *deux goûts*, without reference to any school of thought. A protest is made against the intolerance of the Pseudo-Classicists, and against the impatience of the reformers; after all, states the critic, it was not a system that produced *Le Théâtre de Clara Gazul*. The critic may have his predilections, but, in his rôle of critic, he must be unbiassed. The *Globe* agrees with Ampère, where he states that the Classical works will not suit modern times because they do not express modern ideas. This consideration brings Ampère to the subject of imitation. This division of *littérateurs* cannot be absolute, because Nature admits of no such thing; the *Globe* regards this as an argument against parties in literature. "J'avoue que cette scission absolue serait commode pour les faiseurs de systèmes et donnerait beau jeu aux deux partis pour se proscrire mutuellement; mais, malheureusement pour eux, il n'en est pas ainsi." Even the so-called Romanticists have sometimes imitated, for example, Schiller and Shakespeare. The *Globe* has appreciated the philosophic view of individualism, "that the particular cannot exist without the general, and the general without the particular." It seems to us that Ampère had this opinion in mind when he stated that no author could entirely escape the influence of his fellows; if this were not so, society, and especially literature, would be in a state of chaos; nothing is, in reality, absolute. "De tout cela il résulte, non pas qu'il n'y ait point deux littératures et surtout deux tendances, l'une classique, l'autre romantique, mais seulement qu'elles sont moins distinctes et moins ennemies qu'on ne les suppose fréquemment"; here we have another instance of the independence of the *Globe*.

July 9th, 1825. *Meeting of the Académie Française.*

The Academy had lost its popularity, because it represented a system which was distasteful to many; as it was then constituted, it was incompatible with the idea of freedom in literature. M. Droz makes some remarks on the Romantic revolt, and he urges men to deal with it in the following manner: "Produisez des émotions nouvelles, mais par des moyens qui satisfassent la raison et le goût." New emotions would soon be stifled by the academical idea of good taste. C. Delavigne, in reply, proposes a *modus vivendi* between the two factions, and, to emphasise its position, the *Globe* supports him.

Oct. 1st, 1825. *Le Romantisme considéré historiquement.*
M.D.

The *Globe* describes the disdainful manner in which the term *romantisme* was first received in France; this feeling arose from the domineering spirit of the age, but people soon recognised that the movement had its roots deep down in the souls of men. We think that the *Globe*, in this article, regards the Tendency as of mushroom growth; such was not the case; it was a perfectly natural evolution which had been in progress since the days of Rousseau. The *Globe* is disappointed that no set definition was given of Romanticism, but we can hardly expect one on account of its individualistic nature. It is composed of so many units; we may generalise the features which these different units have in common, but we cannot overlook the presence of the individual. It may be more satisfactory, under the circumstances, to regard the Tendency as composed of authors who have certain general principles in common, but who follow their own bent. "La littérature est

l'expression de la société" seems to be a generally accepted definition, but it does not meet the wishes of the *Globe*. The *Globe*, true to its individual bias, desires to particularise it. It quotes the German view of Romanticism which consisted of a particular literary type, and expresses approval of this standpoint. Its own particular opinion on the matter is as follows: "Il existe dans toutes les littératures originales un trait commun qui est l'originalité, chacune d'elles renferme aussi quelque chose qui lui est propre." The editors thus state explicitly that the particular and general elements are necessary to individual inspiration. The particular literary type of the Germans certainly had its reflection in actual life, for otherwise it would be unnatural and artificial—altogether outside the sphere of true art. We see then that the *Globe* accepted the German view because it coincided with its own opinion. The opinion quoted above tells us that the poet expressed the ideas of his age, but, in order to be individualistic, he had to express them in his own way. We can take another view of the question by stating that the poet held certain opinions which were those of the society in which he lived. In both cases the particular and general elements are made manifest. The German view coincides entirely with this definition. Why should the *Globe* accept the first view *in toto*, and seek to particularise a definition which had no need of it, because it contained both the particular and the general elements without being subjected to a process of reasoning? The editors apply the term *romantique* to modern productions only, so that it can be well regarded as a modern journal. Though accepting the term, the *Globe* gives it a wide meaning; it is the broad principle of faithful representation of reality, and not the narrow code of a coterie. We can only expect a multiplicity of definitions if we accept the individualistic view of Romanticism. The critic connects the Tendency with Chateaubriand by regarding Christianity as a feature thereof. He does so for two reasons: first, that it is

purely a personal matter ; second, that it is so intimately connected with the history of the age. The *Globe* regards the Tendency as a form of spiritualism, and, as this was bound to be antagonistic to the prevailing philosophical views, it is no wonder that it did not succeed. This philosophy was, however, gradually disappearing under the influence of a spirit which had been agitating the whole of Europe for some time, and of which the Tendency formed part. The critic does not state that the religious inspiration of the poets was slowly supplanting these positivistic ideas. Spiritualism was undoubtedly one of the features of the movement, but it was not the only one. The new ideals had not been introduced into France ; they were the growth of French soil, and the foreign literatures which did accelerate their consummation were nothing more than influences. The *Globe* puts the whole question on a philosophical basis, without which the Tendency could hardly subsist.

Oct. 29th, 1825. *Le Romantisme.*

The critic remarks that the only bond of union between the modern poets was their desire for innovation, but each one gave his own interpretation of things. It may seem as if the *Globe* was supporting the Romanticists as a school, but these words will dispel that idea. "Le romantisme n'est plus un genre que le protestantisme n'est une religion ; ses croyances, ses théories sont toutes négatives ; et c'est entre la routine et l'indépendance, entre l'immobilité et le mouvement, qu'il s'agit de choisir." It pleads for innovation, but its position is that of the disinterested critic. It goes on to maintain its neutral position when it objects to any set manner of literary production ; it was not the *Globe's* fault if some of the modern poets happened to agree with it. Individual reason had reasserted its sway, and, with its advent, men found it impossible to place any restrictions on genius.

"Il ne s'agit pas de commenter un mot mais de faire prévaloir une doctrine; cette doctrine, c'est la liberté"; these words are not those of a party hack. "Commentons donc par abattre cette bastille littéraire que deux siècles d'habitude ont élevée; et une fois le terrain déblayé, que le génie s'en empare pour y construire ce qu'il voudra." The plea for modernity is perhaps the only one which the *Globe* has in common with the Tendency, and it goes so far as to allow *perfect* freedom to the authors, once the old fabric has been demolished. Neither does it espouse any system—"loin de nous alors l'idée de lui tracer un plan, de lui prescrire des proportions, de lui imposer d'invariables modèles." If the authors are deserving of praise, they get it; but if their works are faulty, then they are criticised.

Dec. 6th, 1825. *Le Journal des Débats*.

On the 1st of December, 1825, the *Journal des Débats* published a manifesto dealing with the Romantic Movement. The writer, who signs himself M.Z., takes exception to the remarks made by the author of the anonymous article published in the *Globe*, November 26th, 1825; he claims that the word *romantique* can be applied to every work produced in France since the time of Louis XIV. This conclusion is so general that the *Globe* naturally expresses its surprise. However, it congratulates the *Journal des Débats* on the way it treats its opponents. M.Z. remarks that if the definition ("la littérature, l'expression de la société") is to be applied to the Romanticists, their compositions must be regarded as the expression of a frivolous age, because the public was then fond of meditation and novels. The *Globe* is careful to distinguish between works which owe their existence to a passing fancy and those which are the true expression of the age. M.Z. failed to make out a case, because he did not make this distinction. Another

estimable critic (M.A.D.) states that the modern poets were lacking in good taste, and he, therefore, concludes that they did not possess a grain of common sense. They refused to acknowledge any authority in literature, and demanded freedom for genius. These few examples will serve to show the kind of literary criticism which was then rampant, and they will also bring out the high qualities of the editors of the *Globe*.

Dec. 25th, 1825. *Blackwood's Magazine*.

Though the references of this magazine to French literature are rather pointless, yet the *Globe* is congratulated on its position of independence. Speaking of this compliment, the *Globe* once more affirms its neutrality, "l'horreur que nous avons pour les coteries." Neither did it desire anyone to regard the renaissance of French literature as a party struggle; the Tendency appealed to the editors as a progress in the realm of letters. The *Globe* enquired whether a particular work fulfilled the general canons of literature: "Il n'est point cause de la révolution qui s'opère dans la critique, mais il en est le symptôme le plus frappant; et, si la probité, l'impartialité, le courage nous attirent quelque estime, nous pouvons accepter cette récompense avec autant de franchise que nous en mettrions à repousser des éloges qui élèveraient trop haut nos modestes travaux." We would draw especial attention to the statement that the *Globe* regarded its own appearance as the result of this revolution in literature; the revolution was not really a matter of set rules, but it rested on certain broad principles, so that the *Globe* had to proceed on these broad lines.

Feb. 2nd, 1826. Extracts from the *Constitutionnel*.

In the *Constitutionnel* of January 24th, 1826, we find an article which throws an interesting light upon the controversy which was now raging. The Classicists are supposed to have held a conference, when the following decisions were arrived at :

(a) "A dater de ce jour, il ne sera fait aux romantiques aucune concession, quelque raisonnable qu'elle puisse être." There had been some attempt at union, but if this ever happened, the days of the Classicists would be numbered.

(b) "On aura soin de répéter sans cesse au public, qui finira par le croire, que le romantisme, c'est *Hans d'Islande*, *Le Solitaire* et *Éloa*, et toutes les rêveries de la Société des Bonnes Lettres." The modern poets were excessively mystical, but it is not correct to apply the word *école* to a body of men who were so differently constituted. This is, however, a fair example of the popular idea of Romanticism.

(c) "Comme il importe de bien établir que les Romantiques méprisent la littérature du siècle de Louis XIV, on devra, s'ils attaquent Ancelot, défendre Racine; et plaider pour Corneille, s'ils médisent de de Jouy. L'expérience prouve que ce moyen est fort bon." The modern poets were not disdainful of the works of the reign of Louis XIV; they simply stated that they were not the models for the 19th century. These remarks also shew that the Classicists had no ground to stand on.

(d) "On parle souvent de raison, de goût, d'ordre, de proportion etc., mais sans jamais expliquer ces mots vraiment sacramentaux. Il convient aussi de foudroyer, au nom de l'honneur national, ceux qui se permettent de préférer Walter Scott à Madame de Genlis, et Goethe à Arnault." Their whole method of attack consisted of obscure words; they were avoided by the modern poets,

and by the *Globe*. Modern poets had been inspired by foreign literatures, and the *Globe* had all along set its face against any such practice.

(e) "Les coalisés se garantissent réciproquement l'éloge de leurs ouvrages ; et, pour plus de sûreté, chaque auteur classique sera chargé de se juger lui-même." This gives us a fair idea of the manner in which literary criticism was carried on amongst them ; this was also one of the reasons for the appearance of the *Globe*.

Feb. 11th, 1826. Meeting of *Académie Française*.
P. Dubois.

Dubois makes a few remarks upon the speech which Chateaubriand delivered on this occasion. He is blamed for regarding history in the light of another age, namely as a matter of religion and art. We do not see any reason for deploring this fact, as Chateaubriand represented the views of a large body of the French public. He did not treat the subject after the scientific manner of a Guizot, but he raised it above party level. Objection is taken to the excessive imagination of the poets, as the century was not given up to *la rêverie* ; surely the *Globe* has changed its position on this matter. The criticism is, as usual, given in good part: "Et puis le génie comprend et estime la vérité, ou bien il s'afflige peu d'une erreur de bonne foi. Nulle part, Chateaubriand n'est plus admiré ni plus aimé que parmi nous ; qu'il excuse donc si nous sommes injustes, nous n'avons pas voulu l'être."

March 14th, 1826. *Le Mercure*.

This article is devoted to the criticism of a contemporary called *Le Mercure*. This paper had recently changed its complexion, and this is taken by the *Globe* as evidence in favour of the incompatibility of the old and new ideals. The narrow patriotism and the domi-

neering attitude of the Classicists had stamped out every spark of originality. The editors of the *Globe* call themselves *nous autres indépendants*. Now we come to the point where we must remark that the *Globe* was purely independent, and not in favour of any school of thought as such. The *Mercure* was modern, but its fault, in the eyes of the critic, was the partiality displayed towards the modern poets. The *Globe*, while thus affirming its modern bias, finds reason to differ from a Romantic organ. "Si quelque partialité se faisait sentir pour une jeune école de poésie vaporeuse, trop souvent peu fidèle au goût, c'était, du moins, dans un but honorable." The *Globe* is regarded as a supporter of everything foreign, and so, in reality, all papers with modern tendencies. Once more it urges the separation of the old and new traditions, "les deux écoles vont rester, dit-on, unies sous la même bannière; c'est un miracle à opérer."

April 29th, 1826. *L'Abus de la Critique.*

The *Globe* acknowledges the existence of a revolution in the realm of letters, and, what is more, it claims to be its offshoot. The desire for innovation is so strong that what is new one day becomes old the next; this statement, in itself, denies the existence of a modern school. A passing reference is made to the continual movement of the age; this feeling of unrest was not synonymous with the existence of definite literary opinions. The critic would have done well to state that this characteristic arose from the passions of the age, thus doing away with the idea that it was a blemish on the talent of the modern poets, though, perhaps, it was not very artistic. He attributes the affectation of some authors to this feeling of unrest, but, after all, these mannerisms were the peculiarities of youth. We can, and do distinguish innovations which are the result of originality, and those which are but imitations. Every branch of literature was in progress, but they all succumbed to the

prevailing desire of criticism. The *Globe* utters a word of warning against regarding the state of inaction as denoting progress; this is nothing but a return to the attack against excessive meditation. Speaking of its own criticism, it states, "cette critique a été diverse, elle a varié selon le temps et le caprice." Attention is drawn to the negative criticism which was rampant at the time; it is regarded as of no avail unless it is conducive to actual creation. The *Globe* was in high favour at the time, as can be seen from its testimony, "le public suit avec quelque intérêt le cours de nos opinions; il s'y prête même volontiers, et ne change pas les siennes." The public, unfortunately, felt duty bound to enrol itself under the banner of one of the contending factions, so that it could not give its undivided support to an independent journal. The *Globe*, owing to its neutral position, did not enunciate party views, and so could not point to any productions based upon any set rules, "si l'on entreprenait de juger notre doctrine par ses œuvres, nous ne serions pas médiocrement embarrassés." In the eyes of the critic, every author should study his subject so well that he can grasp the rules which are dependent upon that peculiar subject; not only that, he must adhere to the general rules which underlie all works of art. We find the ideal production in the combination of these two characteristics, and there were many authors who attained to this eminence. The *Globe* had no need to regret that its criticism had not been realised in fact; it was only the blindness of party strife that forced the opposite view on people.

May 2nd, 1826. *Les Avantages de la Critique.* (Letter from a correspondent.)

This correspondent blames the *Globe* for having changed its opinions, but the impression we received from the previous article was that it was contrasting its own ideal criticism with the prevailing one. He appeals

to the works of the modern French historians, but the *Globe* only referred to the shallow productions of some modern authors. The writer favours us with his views on criticism which, in the main, correspond with those enunciated in the preceding article. It is not always necessary to clear ruins away, for we can set up a fabric on an entirely new site. There were branches of literature unknown to the Pseudo-Classicists—subjects meet only for modern minds. The *Globe* did not preach the gospel of inaction, but rather that of action. He agrees, at least, that the *Globe* did not preach the doctrines of any school.

Oct. 18th, 1827. *La Critique*. Duvergier de Hauranne.

The *Globe* remarks that, owing to the existence of a tradition which was kept alive by ignorance, criticism had to forsake its position of mere observation, and begin to act. The activity could not go further than the mere pointing out of faults, and, in the case of the *Globe*, it never proceeded beyond this. The *Globe's* desire was, "quitter le glaive pour reprendre la balance; examiner les littératures étrangères sans passion et peser leurs défauts comme leurs qualités; pour bien répondre à des haines aveugles, il faut une admiration éclairée." The critic calls M. Delécluze, whose works he judges, a Classicist, because he draws his inspiration from Greece and Rome. He, however, calls this *un penchant*, thus disregarding the terminology of "Classic" and "Romantic." The *Globe* goes so far as to agree with M. Delécluze in his admiration of Shakespeare; if it was a Romantic organ, it was not likely to agree with the members of the opposing faction on one single point. They agree once more that style is inseparable from thought. It shews its modernity by disagreeing with the author, where he states that a language can be stationary. Béranger, Lamartine, and Hugo uttered new and harmonious strains without dislocating the language at all.

"Heureusement il y a dans le monde place pour tous les goûts"; this statement does away with the idea of any favoured party in literature.

April 8th, 1829. *Style Symbolique*. "L...x" (Leroux).

The critic, first of all judges the *Roméo et Juliette* of M. Delécluze, a frequent contributor to the columns of the *Journal des Débats*. Delécluze states that the change which was coming over French literature was due to the introduction of English and northern idioms and ideas, and he infers that it was altogether a mistake to engraft a Teutonic on a Romance language. The *Globe* answers that the new movement was purely French as far as it concerned France, and that the foreign influences were but secondary causes. Of course the movement was widespread in other countries as well, but they each possessed different features, and so must be considered, one apart from the other. The critic agrees that it was necessary to remould the language in order to express aspirations hitherto unknown, but this could be done without any revolutionary change. Hugo personified the ideals of the 19th century, but, by common consent, no one adhered more rigidly to the rules of French grammar. Delécluze attributes the quality of *rêverie* to the northern poets, but the critic quotes the names of many French poets who had the same effect on their readers, and yet were free from any northern influences. He goes so far as to state that poetry and metaphor are synonymous terms; the word metaphor is to include comparisons, symbols, allegories. He also states that, when the abstract term can be superseded by an image, the expression becomes vague; this is his view of modern mysticism. We can clearly see how they became mystical, but we should go deeper down than *un procédé de style* to find out the why and the wherefore. They were mystical, because they could not be true poets

unless they reflected some feature, at least, of the age in which they lived. We find this *procédé* in Racine :

"Comment en un plomb vil l'or pur s'est-il changé?
 Quelle Jérusalem nouvelle
 Sort du fond du désert brillante de clartés?"
 (Joad in *Athalie*.)

This is an example of a true symbol, but if we quote a few lines of Hugo, we meet with something quite different :

"Il (Napoléon) a bâti si haut son aire impériale,
 Qu'il nous semble habiter cette sphère idéale
 Où jamais on n'entend un orage éclater.
 Ce n'est plus qu'à ses pieds que gronde la tempête ;
 Il faudrait pour frapper sa tête
 Que la foudre pût remonter.
 La foudre remonta....."

(*Les Deux Îles*.)

The symbolism is much more direct in this instance ; it had almost reached a stage of perfection. Then follows a definition of symbolism as it was practised by the modern poets—"le poète ne développe pas l'idée de la grandeur de Napoléon, mais il passe tout de suite à l'image ; il n'y a même pas de comparaison, le mot d'aigle n'est seulement pas prononcé ; et cependant rien n'est plus clair que cette pensée en images. Voilà le symbole." The example taken from Racine is in consonance with his power of faithful portraiture of inward feelings. Hugo is individualistic, in that he carries the desire for *un style éclatant* further than any other modern poet. The only inconvenience which, in our opinion, results from such a style is that too much attention is paid to the exterior of poetry at the expense of the inward inspiration. This fault is frequent in the works of Hugo ; poetry becomes merely *un jeu de mots*. The *Globe* favours this symbolism as conducive to the manifold expression of one single idea ; if we regard the matter in this light, we can take it as an example of the unlimited possibilities of the Tendency, but, by making this ad-

mission, we connote the individualistic idea which is so intimately connected with the movement. We could quote many more instances of its prevalence, but the critic gives it undue prominence by calling it *la grande innovation*. The *Globe* supports our statement that the Tendency was not of sudden growth, and that it dated as far back as the age of Rousseau; "s'il fallait assigner une origine à cette innovation, nous dirions que les ouvrages de J.-J. Rousseau l'ont provoquée, quoique par son style Jean-Jacques n'appartienne aucunement à la famille d'écrivains dont il fut le précurseur." The *Globe* accounts for this coincidence by stating that Rousseau was fond of meditation, but it takes great care not to make us think that he established a school. The critic also states that he influenced Bernardin de Saint Pierre, thus linking this author also with the Tendency. We have no need to refer to his imaginative style to establish the connection, but we must not regard this as the only feature of the Tendency. The *Globe* unconsciously traces the growth of the same movement by analysing the progress of symbolism. Chateaubriand is also said to have continued the same features; the whole revolution is not, as Delécluze infers, imitation, but the expression of deeply felt needs; in conclusion, the movement can be summed up as follows, "l'influence de tout ce qui compose ce qu'on appelle l'esprit du siècle." The critic rightly regards the movement as not confined to France alone; it was everywhere produced by the same sentiments—meditation and love of nature. Some critics claimed André Chénier as the forerunner of the movement, but, with the exception of Sainte-Beuve, they were not *littérateurs* of any note. Speaking of *le mélange des genres*, Chénier says:—

"La Nature dicta vingt genres opposés
D'un fil léger entre eux chez les Grecs divisés.
Nul genre, s'échappant de ses bornes prescrites,
N'aurait osé d'un autre envahir les limites,
Et Pindare à sa lyre, en un couplet bouffon,
N'aurait point de Marot associé le ton."

Further on he makes a vigorous onslaught on modern poets, especially for their imaginative poetry :—

“Délires insensés ! Fantômes monstrueux,
Et d'un cerveau malsain rêves tumultueux,
Ces transports déréglés, vagabonde manie,
Sont l'accès de la fièvre et non pas du génie.”

These two examples serve to prove that Chénier was not one of the modern poets. His versification introduced a few innovations, but they were the result of the study of classical models, and not the outcome of individual creation. The *Orientales* of Hugo are quoted as the most glaring example of this strong imagination ; we must admit (a thing which, strange to say, the *Globe* does not) that this quality, however pleasant it may be, is dangerous, in that it so easily oversteps the bounds of reality. This is the main feature of Hugo's works ; at times it endows him with noble aspirations, and at others causes him to descend to trivialities. The one outstanding example is *Mazeppa*, which is nothing but one perfect symbol. It becomes tedious when one attempts to read it right through ; it dazzles the reader with its flashes of brilliancy. The *Globe* regards Hugo as one of the poets of the Tendency, when it speaks of his *devanciers* in this kind of poetry. The critic also admits that modern poets were independent of one another, by calling attention to the difference between the symbolism of Hugo and that of Lamartine. He states that the symbolism of Hugo is purely *intime*, and this is always the *raison d'être* of this quality. “Jamais le monde littéraire n'a compté plus de sectes différentes qu'aujourd'hui” ; this statement is another proof that the individual reigned supreme, and thus we could not hope to have a uniform system. The critic pleads for the examination of every individual effort in the hope of gaining something tangible ; no remark whatever is made in the interests of any particular literary coterie. The obscurity of some of the poets does not arise from this diversity of modes

of expression, for these differences are but symptoms of individuality which was itself a feature of the age. "En France, les critiques de la nouvelle école poétique, en sont-ils venus à professer que le poète ne doit pas être compris de tout le monde, mais qu'il doit se faire son public, ses adeptes, ses fidèles, presque comme s'il écrivait dans une langue inconnue." We see then that the *Globe* does not classify itself among the critics of the movement. It has always demanded that the poet should express the general aspirations of his age in such a way that he could be understood by all.

Oct. 7th, 1829. *Précis d'un Traité de Poétique.*

Leduc. C. MAGNIN.

The critic rejoices that the old rules have disappeared, and that now everything is individualistic. He hopes that the bond of union will be one of common admiration, and not any system; in fact, all the efforts of criticism are to be concentrated to prevent the recurrence of any such calamity. The *Globe* proceeds to define its position as compared with that of the classical school, and, as it is of some importance, we must treat it at some length. There is first of all a definition of *l'esthétique* in its connection with poetry; "la connaissance de tous les phénomènes qu'éprouve l'âme humaine à l'état poétique"; in other words, the statement of the conditions under which, and the manner in which our thoughts pass over to the state of poetry. The critic claims that all systems could find their *raison d'être* in this form of *l'esthétique*. If this be true, we see no reason why individualistic poets, however much they differ, should be regarded as wholly antagonistic; in fact the existence of this quality constitutes the ground upon which they all meet. A system of poetics, according to the critic, works as follows: "Un système de poétique ne recueille que quelques notions partielles, quelques méthodes traditionnelles, quelques procédés de

facture, tous faits contingents et qui ne sont que par la volonté de l'artiste." The old system was then, from the point of view of psychology, on a wrong basis. Hugo aptly states, in his *Préface de Cromwell*, that an artist has to follow out the general rules of art, without which no composition can subsist; he is, however, free to evolve, in any manner he pleases, the secondary rules which emanate from the study of his subject. We can then conclude that the independence of the poet is guaranteed by the freedom allowed him to do what he pleases with his subject. This independence cannot descend to licence, because he has the general rules of art to check him. The critic attributes the existence of so many codes of good taste to the fact that people confused these two principles; he also protests against the existence of barriers in literature. The *Globe* desired a modern poetry, suited to the needs of the times. It laid emphasis on the statement that each poet continued the tradition in his own way ("chacun à leur manière"), thus upholding its individualistic bias.

Nov. 11th, 1829. Idem.

M. Leduc is congratulated for having stated that there could be nothing absolute in the literatures of the time. He states: "La langue poétique a sa grammaire et si les règles qui doivent ériger la pensée, sont incertaines; celles qui déterminent son expression, sont positives." The *Globe* accuses Leduc of contradicting himself, but it seems to us that it was guilty of the very same thing. The editors stated that their motto was "Asservissement aux règles de la langue, indépendance pour tout le reste," and now we find them blaming Leduc for saying the same thing, though in different words. This principle was quite a practical one; there is the example of Hugo, who, though careful to obey grammatical rules, yet followed his own fancy in every other detail. Our attention is drawn to the innovations

introduced by De Vigny in the *More de Venise*, where he attempts to make the Alexandrine verse more supple.

The critic discovers caesuras even in Racine :—

"Ils courent; tout son corps n'est bientôt qu'une plaie."
(*Phèdre*.)

But it is not strange to find one in De Vigny :—

"Oh! si votre serment
Dispose de mes jours, permettez seulement."
(*Fille de Jephthé*.)

Neither is it strange to find one in the works of Hugo; the poem, *La Marche Turque*, is nothing but a series of caesuras. The critic rightly attributes these innovations to the modern poets; if such was not the case, there was no difference between them and the Pseudo-Classicists. These stray examples, culled from the earliest poets, cannot be considered as evidence because they were so rare.

Jan. 23rd, 1830. *Manifesto by the Editors.*

The editors proceed to give the reasons why the *Globe* was going to appear daily. They remark, speaking of their position in earlier years, as follows: "Revendiquer d'abord la liberté littéraire, nous acharner contre les préjugés nationaux, adorer les chefs-d'œuvre étrangers à l'égal de nos immortelles gloires, révéler des noms inconnus, inquiéter les imaginations de mille rêves, de mille besoins nouveaux, ce fut notre première mission." It was a modern paper, but yet, independent of both factions, "ce n'était ni fol amour de la nouveauté ni inquiétude d'esprits blasés qui nous poussait à la réforme, comme c'était conséquence du principe de liberté posé par la révolution, on nous démêla bientôt tout-à-fait." There is to be no change of position, though the paper has changed hands, "il n'y a que la science positive des systèmes et des hommes, l'analyse suivie et détaillée des ouvrages, l'exploration variée des

littératures, qui puisse exciter la curiosité allanguie; nous avons ambitionné un noble rôle dans la régénération morale de notre pays; c'est l'heure des critiques sévères." The object of the editors is nothing less than the complete regeneration of French literature; this is to be attained by searching, independent criticism. The same spirit prompts the criticism of foreign literatures, "mais nous percerons le secret de leurs faiblesses, comme nous avons révélé leurs grandeurs."

April 3rd, 1830. *Lamartine at the Academy.*

Sainte-Beuve thinks that Lamartine left for Italy because he was disappointed at not being elected a member of that august assembly. We beg to differ from the critic; first, because Lamartine had no great desire for the honour; secondly, because he went to Italy in 1820 to take up an appointment at the French Embassy at Naples, so that it was not altogether a matter of inclination. His stay there undoubtedly intensified his meditative turn of mind, but it also helped to enhance the value of his works. Sainte-Beuve tells us that the differences between Lamartine and the other modern poets were far-reaching, but he has no hesitation in classifying him with Chateaubriand and Hugo. He also considers this movement as a tendency pure and simple, because it had yet to reach its consummation. Lamartine himself spoke favourably of the Tendency, and this was only natural, seeing that he had contributed largely to its progress. He gave utterance to the following sentiments: "Heureux ceux qui viennent après nous, car le siècle sera beau; le fleuve a franchi sa cataracte; plus profond et plus large, il poursuit désormais son cours dans un lit tracé; et s'il est troublé encore, ce ne peut être que de son propre limon." He acknowledges its success, and gives a hint to the members of the Academy to open wide the doors to every deserving talent, "sans acception de système"; these last

words sum up the views of the *Globe*. M. Cuvier, in reply, stated that they rejected no *reasonable* innovator, but, as Sainte-Beuve well points out, the *immortals* had changed their opinion. A few months back they were advocating a war of extermination against the Tendency; this change of position proves that it had made some progress.

Oct. 11th, 1830. *Le Mouvement Littéraire après 1830.*

The *Globe* remarks that French literature was modified after the Revolution of 1830. It also proves that a literature changes only in its mode of expression, as there are certain general principles which are immutable; this is the view of an independent journal. We cannot follow the critic when he states that French literature was now going in a new direction; this revolution can hardly be called a break; its only effect was to intensify the Tendency, which had been growing since the time of Rousseau. Hugo and his confrères were not changing their manner, for they possessed the same characteristics all along; they were simply becoming more mature. Rousseau is quoted as an exception to this rule, but hardly enough praise is bestowed upon him, as it was he who undoubtedly heralded the dawn which was breaking upon French literature. People were so engrossed in the events of the French Revolution that literature was not so much in vogue, but, for all this, it was having its effects. The change which was taking place first arose in men's deepest feelings; the *Globe* thus recognises its individual bias. Madame de Staël had vague aspirations towards an ideal of the future; this feeling had its reflection in the opinions of the age. If she was not very well understood at the time, it was because her ideas were rather novel, and contrary to the accepted tradition. Chateaubriand appealed to those who were religiously inclined—the reaction against the ideas of the 18th century; though fond of Middle Age

subjects, his inspiration was eminently personal. The critic regards these two authors as embodying the ideas of the Tendency. He was not going to reduce it to a uniform system, because they reached the same goal though on different lines. The *Martyrs* is unlike real life, but it contains a wealth of personal experience. This work was not appreciated, because the age had not entirely rid itself of its materialistic spirit. It seems strange to classify the *Aveugle* of André Chénier with these works, because it had hardly any features in common with modern inspiration. The critic calls attention to the example set by Chateaubriand in combining religion and the Middle Ages. The *Globe* does not find much to say in favour of the spirit of *rêverie* which was fast becoming a social malady. The word *romantique* is applied to the followers of Chateaubriand, but no mention is made of the other authors who are thus called. There is then no fixed meaning to the word *romantique*, and we cannot call the *Globe* the organ of this party until we possess a complete definition of the word. Neither would we regard the followers of Chateaubriand as a separate coterie, because many others possessed the same features; all were, however, united in their hatred of the traditions of the past. The critic admits that the modern poets were liberal and independent; this is the one bond of union between them. They were to be allowed perfect freedom in everything else. It really did not matter whether they were in favour of the restored Monarchy or not. The critic attributes the individualistic bias of the age to the fact that the poets, tired of the strenuousness of public life, sought the quietude of solitary meditation. The *Globe* congratulates them on their successful efforts, but, at the same time, we can attribute their peculiarities of thought and expression to this separation from the world. At the close of the Restoration period no new era commenced; the ground had been cleared of old ruins, and it will not do to say that there was a break

of any description in the movement. Why could not men of all political parties join together in the Tendency, provided that they possessed the right ideals? Modern authors did not leave the past with expressions of regret; they were perfectly modern in their ideas, because they explained the past in the light of the present, and sought lessons for the future. If the Tendency had gone back in its ideals, its death-knell would have been sounded.

Jan. 18th, 1831. *Manifesto by P. Leroux.*

Leroux accounts for the new position of the *Globe*, now that it has become the organ of the *Doctrine Saint-Simonienne*. He states that the paper has never been attached to any literary coterie, and this evidence is unusually strong, because the writer had been connected with it ever since its inception. Leroux acknowledges that the editors had, perhaps, been too irresponsible, but he claims that they were now reunited around the standard of *la liberté*. The *Globe* had always stood up for freedom, though, perhaps, the desire of its editors to be independent had not inclined people to the belief that such was the case.

Aug. 12th, 1831. *L'Académie Française.*

Speaking of the Academy, the *Globe* gives expression to the following views; "impossible de rien voir de plus artificiel que tous ces discours d'oisifs littérateurs et de littérateurs oisifs qui consentent encore à se passionner pour ces questions mortes de classique et de romantique." These words shew that the *Globe*, even amidst its recent changes, upholds the banner of independence, and supports a literature in consonance with the needs of the age.

Aug. 30th, 1831. *Politique et Beaux-Arts.*

The *Globe* deplures that literature is on the decline, and it attributes this to the stirring events of the time; the public had no time to read poetry. The *Globe* is too pessimistic, when it states that writers had no mission. Their object was to express the aspirations of the age, and right well did they fulfil their mission. We agree with the critic that they were bound to touch on politics, but a reservation must be made to the effect that they were not to write in support of any party; they would then become politicians pure and simple. The critic states that *Marion Delorme*, *Maréchale d'Ancre*, *Notre Dame de Paris* were not well received, because the authors had not suited their works to the needs of a society whose only ideal was political. *Marion Delorme* was prohibited, because it was not welcome in certain high places; it was political, but within the limits of art. The critic mentions this misuse of talent; he should blame the public for its lack of appreciation, and not the poets; they were modern enough, and the *Globe*, in this particular instance, carries its ideal of modernity a little too far. It returns to its old position, when it protests against the exclusive individualism of some of the poets. After a few depreciatory remarks on the quarrel of the Classicists and the Romanticists, the critic shews the futility of laying down any fixed rule on literary questions, "on se dispute sur le beau du moyen âge comme si c'était là un type éternel, immuable, qui pût représenter les besoins et les passions des hommes au milieu desquels nous vivons,"—even now the *Globe* had nothing to do with any school. The modern poets were no better, according to the critic, than the Pseudo-Classicists in their treatment of Middle Age subjects. The Romanticists took up these themes with a view of explaining the phenomena of the present, while the others proceeded from an inordinate love of

the past, which was false because it was sadly out of date. The critic again blames Lamartine for appealing to a chosen few rather than to the generality of mankind. If the prevailing idea is political, we agree that the poet must also be so to some extent, but he must not follow it at the expense of art.

Jan. 3rd, 1832. *La Poésie telle que nous la concevons.*

The position of the paper is set forth as follows: "préoccupés par une idée fixe, celle de les arracher à leurs dégoûts, à leur désespoir, à leur poésie de cabinet, nous avons pris à cœur de leur faire mettre le doigt sur leurs ulcères et leurs plaies." The mission of the *Globe* had been of a literary character, to attempt to bring modern poets to a high level of literary excellence. It was opposed to their passion for the Middle Ages, but we fail to understand this position, as the authors were modern even in this phase of their inspiration. The *Globe* was now entering upon a new era; it was the time for constructive criticism. The whole outlook is bound up with the fortunes of *la Religion St-Simonienne*.

April 8th, 1832. *La Critique.* M. Joncières.

M. Joncières states that, in the years gone by, the *Globe* possessed no real criticism, and that literature was only noticed in so far as it served political ends. We must say that we did not receive this impression; the *Globe*, in all its articles, pleads for strict independence, and, more important still, strenuously opposes those organs which made a political weapon of literature. We attribute this change of front to the influence of the new religion. They would change the appearance of *Notre Dame de Paris* and recast *Marion Delorme*. They would separate the fortunes of "Claude Frolo," "Quasimodo," and "L'Esméralda." The whole interest of the plot would thus disappear, and we should have

instead, an uniformity which would end in monotony. If they changed the characters of the novels of the time, literature would no longer be a living reality. Looking too far into the future is as disastrous as conjuring up the musty dogmas of the past.

April 19th, 1832. *French Literature.* M. Joncières.

Speaking of the independent position of the *Globe*, M. Joncières says, "nous avons frappé sur tous les livres." Mention is made of the purely modern poets, "nous avons lancé l'anathème sur eux." The *Globe* did not favour a narrow individualism, for it preached the doctrine of universal brotherhood. In conclusion, English literature appeals to the eyes, while the German appeals to the mind. French literature is placed somewhere between the two, in that it appeals to the heart. The *Globe* returns to its eclectic position by proposing a kind of Holy Alliance between all poets.

CHAPTER VII.

THE *GLOBE* AND THE NOVEL.

Sept. 1st, 1825. *Charles*. Anon. Sainte-Beuve.

THE novel, like all other branches of modern French literature, had its romantic leanings. Sainte-Beuve admits that this class of productions had its *précurseurs*. They were Rousseau (*Nouvelle Héloïse*), Madame de Staël (*Corinne*), B. Constant (*Adolphe*), Chateaubriand (*René*); these names have been previously quoted in connection with the other branches of the Tendency. The author of this novel has followed them in almost every detail; he had naturally to prepare himself for his work by meditation. He expressed his own sentiments, and peopled the world with creatures of his own imagination; and, what is more, by incorporating his own personality with the work, he identified himself with the Tendency. It is strange that Sainte-Beuve did not mention that the same features were to be found in the works of Rousseau, and of the writers who followed him. He opens the article by protesting against the excessive *rêverie* which results in a state of unreality. The *Globe* is always severe on the abuse of every literary gift, "c'est l'abus seul qu'il en faut proscrire"; genius and talent are no excuse for the misuse of any of these powers. Rousseau was not, as Sainte-Beuve states, so guilty as those who followed him. "Charles" delights in everything that is vague—the sea, the woods, and the solitude of Nature; Love is his one theme. Sainte-Beuve thus

criticises a fault of which he himself is often guilty. He had attempted to connect Ronsard and the modern poets, and he congratulates this unknown author for doing the same thing. After all, the language of the 16th century was not suited to the needs of the 19th, because the ideals were different in both cases. Sainte-Beuve voices the general tendency of the age when he states that Nature struck a particular chord in the hearts of the men of the 19th century, but this is no reason why an author should speak a language unknown to his contemporaries.

March 2nd, 1826. *Bug-Jargal*. Hugo.

We must remember that *Bug-Jargal* was written when Hugo was quite young, and, therefore, our criticism must be temperate; the *Globe*, strange to say, has not even mentioned this matter. The critic complains that the work takes the form of a story told by an individual; this proceeding was certainly inconvenient, but everything was so very individualistic that the author naturally favoured this form. There are, according to the *Globe*, two conflicting interests in the novel; the heroic conduct of the negro, and the personality of "D'Auverney." We prefer to regard the character of "D'Auverney" as the cardinal point of the story, and all others as merely subsidiary. "D'Auverney" is a dreamy, imaginative character—the incarnation of the spirit of the age. The free use of *le grotesque* and *le merveilleux* is to be seen here. "Bug-Jargal" is not a natural character; he has too many fine traits for a man of his calibre. The *Globe* desired to see the contrast of savagery and culture exemplified in his character; this is not the view usually taken by our journal, as, later on, it criticises Hugo for his inordinate love of antithesis. Hugo is acclaimed as a writer of talent, but, in our opinion, his style is too laboured; this weakness can be traced to the influence of his classical training. The *Globe*

is, for all this, a modern paper in sympathy with the highest aspirations of the age; its warns Hugo against imitation of every description; "il devait s'abstenir d'imiter tour à tour diverses écoles et divers auteurs." We cannot agree that his brilliant descriptions were copied from Chateaubriand; though belonging to the same Tendency, they were independent of one another. Modern authors were very much alike, yet they had their peculiar characteristics.

July 8th, 1826. *Cinq-Mars*. De Vigny. Sainte-Beuve.

The critic pertinently remarks that the period chosen was a happy one for a historical novel, but we cannot say that De Vigny was highly successful. As the characters were historical, the author ought to have kept as near as possible to fact. Sainte-Beuve affirms that it was also necessary to allow a certain amount of scope to imagination, but that, at the same time, the characters were not to descend to mere caricatures. The *Globe* had always pleaded for the union of fact and imagination as essential to true art. The critic quotes "Le Père Joseph" and "Lauberdemont" as specific instances of this failing. We think that "Cinq-Mars" himself is not a very natural character; it is unlikely that such a young man would aspire to one of the highest offices of state. The work is full of anachronisms which we need not mention here. De Vigny has, according to Sainte-Beuve, travestied history by trusting too much to his recollections, and, like other modern authors, has been too free with his gift of imagination. We then conclude that all the historical novels of the time were alike; with all their faults, they described the past in a manner worthy of modern ideals. The individualism of the time pervaded the whole of French literature; De Vigny thrusts himself forward under the cloak of his characters. Whenever we read the conversations which he had with his friend "De Thou," we are almost convinced that they

are the words of a young man of the 19th century. Sainte-Beuve, speaking undoubtedly of the chapters entitled "les Adieux" and "le Confessional," remarks:—"Lorsque Cinq-Mars et Marie de Gonzague s'entretiennent, on s'aperçoit trop que De Vigny est en tiers avec eux." Furthermore, he has been inspired by authors who formed part of this modern movement; this can be seen from the quotations which he makes at the beginning of each chapter from such writers as Byron and C. Nodier. De Vigny erred on the side of modernity, as his descriptions of the past are too much after the style of the 19th century. He has written some remarkably fine chapters, and we were particularly struck with the one where he describes a storm in the Pyrenees. Sainte-Beuve states, "il n'avait que de l'imagination et de la poésie, et aussi, tout en blâmant beaucoup, je louai de grand cœur à ce dernier titre le début du XXXIII^{ème} livre, l'Absence, dont le mouvement est si heureux et qui ressemble à un motif d'élégie." Poetry was the strong point of the modern writers, but they completely spoilt their novels by displaying their power of lyrical expression, instead of describing the characters in their natural surroundings. This fault can be traced to the fact that they were not conversant enough with the world; after all, this was not true individualism. The *Globe* has judged him rather severely, because he was possessed of great talent. He has unlimited powers of imagination, and, according to the critic, he was prevented from going to extremes by his extensive acquaintance with the world; so much so, that he has produced a veritable drama. We are told that the language of De Vigny was not sufficient for his inspiration; the result is that he uses *le prétentieux*—a term which, in the opinion of Sainte-Beuve, is synonymous with *romantique*. This word has thus so many different acceptations that we feel justified in regarding this revolution in literature as a Tendency, pure and simple.

Aug. 30th, 1827. *Le Nain Politique*. Choiseul-Gouffier.

The critic protests against the servile imitation of Scott, and particularly of his *Redgauntlet* and *Guy Mannering*. He further states that imagination must play a large part in works of this nature, but, at the same time, he protests against the practice of quoting an obscure annalist as the authority on which to base the existence of a character. The whole issue should depend upon the interest with which the author desires to invest it. The *Globe* thus holds the balance between fact and imagination, and urges authors to seek the happy mean in the study of human nature.

Feb. 4th, 1829. *Le Dernier Jour d'un Condamné*.
V. Hugo.

In the *Globe* of June 3rd, 1828, we noticed a cutting from an American paper purporting to be the confession of a man condemned to death; to say the least, it sounds quite natural. Hugo had, perhaps, been inspired by these words. The work appeals to the critic as one of the best of its kind produced by the Tendency; it is individualistic, in that it shews a keen psychological insight; it is but a continuation of the spirit displayed in the *Adolphe* of B. Constant. It required a strong penetration to understand the intense feelings of a man in this position. The *Globe* complains that the analysis is rather cold and abstract. This power of analysing man's inward feelings was fast becoming a system, and even Hugo did not entirely escape its evil influence. The work would not be Hugo's if it were not imaginative, and full of descriptions, overpowering in their brilliancy; these descriptions did actually cloud the main object of the work. This was a danger against which the *Globe* always warned young authors; it generally led to a style which was the reverse of simple.

Sept. 30th, 1829. *Le Travers du Siècle*.
G. Drouineau. C...s.

The critic lays down a rule for the *genre* known as *le roman moral*; the writer must have a fixed aim, and all circumstances must help to realise this aim; the same rule can be applied to all novels. The *Globe* again pleads for common sense, even in the novel; reading between the lines, we regard these remarks as an attack upon the unseemly parade of harrowing feelings which the modern authors affected so often. The critic intensifies the negative character of the Romantic Movement by stating that Drouineau has given a faithful representation of the evils of the age, but that he has not specified any remedy. The nervous temperament of modern writers was due, according to the critic, to the stirring events of the times, and we conclude from this statement that the Romantic Movement was a living reality. This consideration made severe criticism all the more necessary—"il fallait traiter cette jeunesse qui a tant d'avenir, avec un amour sévère et pieux." The novel, like every other branch of literature of the time, was imaginative, florid in its expressions, individualistic—in a word, the incarnation of the spirit of the age.

Dec. 19th, 1829. *Ismaël Ben Kaisar*. Denis. Leroux.

Due attention must be paid in the historical novel, states the critic, to the action, the characters, the time, and the scene of the action. He singles out character as the most important of these features. If the principle, "la littérature l'expression de la société," which the *Globe* affirms so often, holds good, the characters must remain true. Summing up, the critic states that the object of the historical novel is the portraiture of the individual. This is not all, however, for we must be able to describe in general terms the period in which the individual lived, and must also not proceed further than his history

in order to possess sufficient data upon which to base our conclusions. The historical novel becomes a mere description if we do not link the two together; this view is true of every other branch of the Tendency. The critic thinks that M. Denis, who usually described every period directly, was led astray by *les scènes historiques* which were then in vogue. The procedure followed in this *genre* was too artificial for the historical novel; not enough attention was paid to the study of character. We are told, and rightly so, that the historical novel has greater need of characters than tragedy, which only represents one action, and where everything else is subsidiary. History, according to the *Globe*, can never be the *raison d'être* of the drama, but it must form the greater part thereof, the *lacunæ* being supplied by imagination. The critic advises writers to think of some event, full of dramatic conception, and then to make everything subsidiary to this one fact. The *Globe* notices the inroads of History into all the domains of literature; we would not view this fact with apprehension, but rather regard it as a proof of the living forces which were acting for good on French literature. The idea of Columbus struck M. Denis, but, true to the prevailing fashion, he must needs enwrap the character in mystery; his imagination has afforded us many brilliant descriptions. The characters of the novel are far too historical for the critic; here we have another example of the middle course steered by the *Globe* between the excessive imagination of the younger authors and the rank materialism of the others. If we were asked why "Nouma-Koali" is such an ideal character, we should answer that M. Denis was under the influence of the prevailing imagination when he created it; it is delightful, yet so unreal that it recalls to memory the works of Lamartine. The uncertain desires of the age account, to a large extent, for the vagueness of the characters, but the critic does not even mention the matter. M. Denis collects the general traits of a nation, and, from these

premises, attempts to draw a particular conclusion. This is, historically speaking, rather a risky process, even when the events come in natural sequence, and are not put together in order to force a conclusion. He has thus failed to combine the general and the particular elements, but, after all, this is more or less of an ideal in the realm of history. A reference is made to the influence of Bernardin de St-Pierre; the *Globe* thus connects modern writers with those who possessed the same ideals at an earlier time. It does not care to see history taken over bodily into the drama and the novel; it should be blended with imagination. Neither does it favour the entire separation of the *genres* according to the old rules, but it suggests the advisability of a principle of just balance between them.

March 4th, 1830. *Le Roi de Bohême*. C. Nodier. C...s.

This novel, according to the critic, is fantastic and vague—both eminent qualities of modern authors. It appeals to us because it describes Nodier himself. This is not the only reason why it was so successful; the work can be called individualistic, because it describes a condition of affairs which arose from the state of society at the time; the particular and the general elements are thus present. The *Globe*, though praising the genius of the author, severely criticises his mysticism and imagination.

April 16th, 1830. *La Confession*. Anon. K.

The critic thinks that the author has shewn the actual existence of *le mal du siècle*; we cannot, however, call this a period of transition, because certain general principles were being realised. The author has created a world of imaginary beings, and, thus, finds no favour with the *Globe*; he would not have fallen a victim to this fault, had he come into personal contact with the

world. We are bound to accept this statement, because it was the total absence of reality that vitiated some works. However slight an author's connection is with the outer world, if he has made full use of his powers of observation, he is bound to reproduce it in his works. A definitely established school of modern poetry did not exist; for we find the author who possessed in a full measure the modern tendencies, satirising his fellows.

May 25th, 1830. *Clothilde*. Gaspard de Pons. C...s.

We have always been opposed to the idea of regarding the Romantic Tendency as a uniform whole; in support of this view, we would quote the words of Gaspard de Pons, who claims to be a violent sectary:—"Mais il trouve naturel que les novateurs se divisent entre eux sur quelques points." He also regards Rousseau as a forerunner of the Tendency—"il s'est refusé à penser que l'oubli dût désormais engloutir les chefs-d'œuvre de Rousseau"; he seems to have been inspired by the character of Julie. Neither is the critic himself sure of the signification of the word "romantique":—"nous qui, au milieu de nos doutes sur la question du romantisme, etc." The characteristic vagueness of the age is attributed, in the first instance, to Rousseau.

Oct. 16th, 1830. *Césaire*. A. Guiraud.

This novel appeals to the critic, because the inspiration is based upon fact. Mention is made of the extravagant use of antithesis which is such a prominent feature of the Tendency. It is individualistic in that it reflects the sentiments of the author, and modern because of its mysticism. Chateaubriand combined Catholicism and modern aspirations, but the *Globe* blames Guiraud for following his example. It could not very well be a Romantic organ, because, in this instance, it discounten-

ances a prominent feature of the Tendency. The critic goes so far as to give the name of *false romanticism* to this mysticism; this remark further accentuates the unsettled meaning of the word *romantique*.

Nov. 28th, 1830. *Le Rouge et le Noir*. Stendhal.

We shall not consider the work itself, as it has no connection with our subject, but the critic has volunteered a few remarks which we must take into consideration. He starts from the standpoint of "la littérature est l'expression de la société"; when things are in a normal state, harmony reigns supreme in literature. When, however, society is disorganised, writers fall back upon individual expression, and, thereby, become unsettled in their inspiration. The *Globe* rightly blames their policy of *laissez-faire*; it begat a carelessness which found its counterpart in their style. The critic quotes Rousseau, Chateaubriand, and other modern authors as examples of this feeling, thereby implying that the Tendency had undergone a process of evolution. The *Globe* does not seem to be a Romantic organ, when it urges the authors to rid themselves of this unhealthy state of mind, though it was one of their favourite mannerisms.

March 12th, 1831. *Plik et Plok*. E. Sue.

Science, according to the critic, studied particular aspects of an universal principle, but now, like literature, it had become particular. If this was true, modern literature was non-existent, as true lyricism depended on the interchange of the general and the particular. The writers of the Tendency still gave their own impressions of the state of society; they had many points of difference, but they were united in their hatred of the traditions of the past. The *Globe* has so intensified the differences between them that it has done away even with this

bond of union. This position controverts the well-known maxim of Hugo, that the general principles of art are unchangeable. The critic has decided views on the innovations recently introduced into French literature, "il n'y a pas un seul de ces ouvrages qui n'ait ouvert dans son temps une route nouvelle." The *Globe* thus believed in the individuality of the poet, but it also proved that the Tendency was a growth which had not reached its consummation, and whose future no one could foretell. This view justifies the position of the *Globe*, and it is the only logical one. It would not be wise to evolve a set of rules, and apply them to a literature whose features were not definitely stated. Sue possesses, in the *Globe's* opinion, the characteristics of the Tendency; high ideals, mysticism, and an inordinate love of antithesis. This isolation from the world does not tend towards the realisation of a healthy spirit in literature. "Nous ne traitons pas la littérature comme un monde distinct et séparé, échappant à la loi de la gravitation sociale; pour nous, les arts ne sont que la face poétique du développement unitaire de l'humanité qui s'éclaire." The *Globe* asks for real inspiration; the time for destructive criticism had passed, there was now need of a constructive policy.

Sept. 4th, 1831. *Le Monde Nouveau*. Rey-Dusseil.

Speaking of the dismemberment of French society, the *Globe* criticises the poets who seek their inspiration from the past. It also mentions a young man, who, tired of the worries of life, separates himself from his fellows, and gives way to an unhealthy egoism. The *Globe* has no sympathy with this isolation, though it is perfectly modern in its opinions. The young poets did not choose Middle Age themes simply for their own sake, as the critic would have us believe, but because they desired to draw some lessons therefrom, and, further, to explain the past in the light of the present. It is

strange that the *Globe* has never properly understood this passion for the Middle Ages ; this inability probably arises from its intense modern ideals. The Romanticists dealt with the Middle Ages from a modern standpoint ; there was not much difference between this method and that of modern history. The *Globe* favours the idea of connecting the Tendency with Rousseau and others, but blames Rey-Dusseil for regarding the year 1832 as the commencement of a new era in French literature.

Sept. 11th, 1831. *Le Diable Boiteux*.

This book was the combined effort of nearly all French authors. It has in itself no literary value, but it shews us the features of the Tendency to which the *Globe* objected. "Voici quelque cathédrale gothique, avec ses ogives, son portail et ses figures de saints, raides et longues"; these remarks must be meant as a satire upon the passion for Middle Age subjects. Neither has it any taste for such a novel as *Notre Dame de Paris*; "n'apercevez-vous pas se dessiner quelque brune figure de bohémienne et quelque forme de chèvre aux cornes dorés." "Le mal du siècle," and the productions which result from it, are not acceptable, "puis il y aura, autour de vous, des figures pâles et mélancoliques de jeunes hommes, des visages soucieux de jeunes filles, une orgie de joies, de tristesses." The *Globe* asks why the authors did not foster true individuality by frequenting the society of their fellow men ; this exclusiveness created unnatural beings, "chacun apportera ses gnomes, ses djins, ses tempêtes, son ciel bleu ou noir." It still believes that, for all practical purposes, the poets are independent in genius, so, to be logical, it has to occupy a neutral position. It also discovered the existence of a passion for everything modern ; this is the reason why it took this maxim as its standpoint. There were different ways of expressing

this view so that the *Globe* could lay down no law. It was established to suit the needs of the time, and it did not conceal the fact that herein lay its *raison d'être*.

April 13th, 1832. *La Révolution*. Salvandy.
P. Rochette.

The critic states that Salvandy spoke an unknown language, because he was out of sympathy with the ideals of his contemporaries. This remark affords us a clue to the peculiar language of some of the modern writers. The *Globe* pleads for a practical solution of the question, and states that all the views put forward to ameliorate French literature will fail, just like *le Contrat Social* of Rousseau, because they are too metaphysical.

CHAPTER VIII.

THE *GLOBE* AND THE THEATRE.

Oct. 6th, 1824. *La Mort du Maréchal de Biron.*
Anon. A.

THE critic states that, owing to the existence of the old traditions, the only way to succeed on the French stage was to follow certain conventional rules. The dramatist himself appealed to writers to take their themes from French history, but, in spite of this behest, he kept to the unities of time and place. As is well pointed out, these rules failed because they were not based upon reason. The *Globe's* criticism was purely literary, "mais qu'il veuille bien croire que nous aussi, nous nous affligeons d'avoir à prononcer de si amères paroles"; its ideals were modern, "c'est, du reste, moins à son ouvrage que nous faisons la guerre qu'au système déplorable aujourd'hui régnant sur notre scène." All dramatists are urged to follow *la vérité*, and to trust to their own genius; the true drama was to find its inspiration in real life.

Nov. 9th, 1824. *Le Fiesque.* Ancelet. A.

The *Globe* sums up the popular opinion of this play; "on assure que la tragédie de Fiesque posera les bases d'un traité d'alliance entre les classiques et les romantiques"; it did not see the purport of these remarks

because it took no cognisance of these two terms. The critic favours this alliance if it means a return to the principle of *la vérité*; but there is to be no truce if it means a continuation of the old rules. The *Globe* is a journal of modern ideas, but it lays down no manner of rule—"en littérature, comme ailleurs, notre devise n'est pas révolution, c'est-à-dire, nouveauté à tout prix; mais liberté, c'est-à-dire, vérité, raison." It has always set its face against imitation as inimical to the progress of literature. The play itself is not thought much of, because it has not materially affected the progress of dramatic art in France. Many people were clamouring for the suppression of the *Théâtre Français* because of its unfair attitude towards modern plays. The *Globe* acknowledges the fairness of these complaints, but strongly disapproves of the extreme opinions of the innovators. "Il serait temps que la Comédie Française ne nous reproduisit pas sans cesse de vieilles mœurs que nous ne comprenons plus."

Dec. 14th, 1824. *Les Deux Fiesques*. Ancelot.

The *Globe* does not judge this play in the light of any rules, but from the point of view of art, "au lieu donc de poser des principes généraux que d'autres principes pourraient combattre, examinons qui a eu la palme dans le grand art de peindre et d'émouvoir." Ancelot does not find favour with the critic because he does not admit the union of tragedy and comedy. The ideal of the critic is to make each character speak its own language, and, above all, to express the sentiments of the age; the view here expressed at once dismisses any idea of system. The *Globe* pleads for truth in the treatment of Middle Age subjects; we would go further and state that these themes have most influence when they are coordinated with the living present. An appeal is made for simplicity of expression; dramatists are expressly warned against circumlocutions as being the bane of

the French stage. The *Globe* advises Ancelot either to reject or to espouse the old rules, and not to try and blend the ancient and modern, thus emphasising its neutral position. The old traditions had such a hold on French playgoers that the task of the reformers became all the more difficult.

Feb. 8th, 1825. *Robin des Bois*. Anon. Duvergier de Hauranne.

The following words are of some interest—"Orphée et Psyché; ceux-là sont classiques et l'on sait à qui l'on à faire; mais pour des diables romantiques, c'est une autre question, et les Français ont trop de délicatesse pour jamais s'en accommoder." The average Frenchman did not like Romanticism on the stage because the old traditions were almost his second nature; this feeling was not likely to be minimised by this production, which possessed all the peculiarities of the German Romanticists. The *Globe* aimed at breaking down the barriers which existed between the literatures of different countries; it, however, regarded these influences as purely secondary, and not as determining factors. The inability of the *Globe* to distinguish writers who followed Classical models, and those who found their inspiration in the Middle Ages, was due to the fact that it did not make a distinction between *mythologie* and *sorcellerie*. The critic rightly upbraids some authors for following antiquated models, but he is certainly not justified in saying the same thing of the works of Scott. These difficulties once surmounted, there would be no need to set up a romantic school, but rather "s'emparer du bon partout où il se trouvera."

March 7th, 1825. *Le Cid d'Andalousie*. P. Lebrun.

The *Globe* takes the opportunity of stating how inefficient the criticism of the old school was; it sums up its position as follows: "mais c'est de l'art que nous

nous occupons." The critic regards the piece as modern because of its vague inspiration. Laharpe, to his mind, retarded the progress of criticism, because his system invariably destroyed the interest of a work; the artistic value of every production depended on the degree of interest aroused. The older critics had an invariable human nature for the stage, and a work which did not conform to this one type appeared unnatural to them. The liberty for which the *Globe* continually pleaded had its limits:—"ouvrons-lui là-dessus un large champ et sachons ne lui interdire que l'absurde." The first part of the statement is in keeping with the liberalism of the *Globe*, but we think that the second portion tends to restrict the author. If the writer paints life in its true colours, there is no danger of his becoming absurd. The critic congratulates Lebrun for taking his inspiration from the realities of life, and also for avoiding the fashionable periphrases. Objection is, however, taken to some of his neologisms; as he had to express certain new aspirations, he was forced to seek new modes of expression; these were perfectly legitimate in so far as they were grammatical. The *Globe* once more affirms its position with no uncertain voice:—"notre journal n'est guère de ceux à qui l'on puisse reprocher des querelles d'acteurs; mais il s'agit encore ici de l'art."

March 17th, 1825. *Jeanne d'Arc*. Soumet. Thiers.

The critic states that the 18th century authors had neglected French national subjects; this is another reason why we cannot regard Chénier as belonging to the Tendency. The *Globe* goes so far as to say that a play of this description would not have succeeded in 1817, because people were too much engrossed in politics; but things had quietened down by now, and literature flourished once more. The power of reason was becoming more and more widespread, and it is in

this connection that history became important. Plays based upon the Middle Ages could not be successful unless they were historically correct. Soumet failed for this very reason, and, like many other dramatists of the time, fell a victim to high sounding phrases and brilliant images; and, consequent upon this, he was blamed for treating a modern subject according to the old traditions.

April 12th, 1825. *Minor Theatres.* K. V.

The vaudeville and the melodrama had escaped the baneful influence of Laharpe. The critic has not much to say on the question; we would add that these in-artistic productions kept reality on the stage, and, in conjunction with the other features of the Tendency, contributed towards the realisation of modern ideals in the theatre. These pieces had to refer strictly to the times in order to fulfil the conditions of the dictum "*la littérature l'expression de la société.*" We might make our meaning clearer if we were to substitute the word *théâtre* for *littérature*. The name of Scribe will always be linked with the vaudeville.

May 21st, 1825. *Minor Theatres.* K. V.

We find a few statements shewing the undoubted progress of the Tendency among the people. One poet is said to have failed at *l'Odéon* because he followed the old traditions; but at *les Variétés*, he followed his own bent, and gained a great ovation. No poet could then succeed with the masses, unless he gave them something real. The same author actually violated the unity of place, but this did not militate against his success, because he was, for all that, following common-sense principles.

June 4th, 1825. *Clara Gazul*. Mérimée. Ampère (J. J.).

The critic congratulates Mérimée on giving us something new, but, far from stating what system the author has followed in these attempts, he treats each work on its merits:—"il y a d'excellents arguments contre tous les systèmes, il n'y en a point contre un bon ouvrage." These comedies succeeded, because the author himself, first of all, felt amused, and then communicated the same pleasure to his readers. The *Globe* goes thus far in its quest for innovation, but it has a strong objection to the passion for antithesis and effect which, we must acknowledge, were the weak points of modern dramatists. Mérimée has not followed the prevalent practice of evolving certain philosophical ideas; true individuality consisted of the painting of the characters of the age. The critic admits that the dramatist has clouded the action by his romantic descriptions, and he excuses this fault by stating that Nature is so constituted. We cannot lay this down as a hard and fast rule, but we can say that it is an example of the perfect union of sentiment and fact. Mérimée belongs to the Tendency in its most prominent feature; he has painted Nature with the noble and the depraved in perfect unison. We found considerable difficulty in following the author owing to the vagueness of many of his passages.

June 18th, 1825. *Letter on "Clara Gazul."*

We cannot agree with the writer that this piece is a realisation of the principles of the *Globe*. Previous to this the journal has never evolved any principles; it has judged every work on its merits; neither has it summarised its remarks on all the productions so as to set up a system. On perusing the list of the collaborators of the *Globe*, we failed to discover the name of Mérimée. The

correspondent incorrectly regarded Mérimée as one of the editors ; he states that the paper would have been more lavish in its praises, had this not, as he supposed, been the case ; we take this as evidence of the neutrality of the journal. We were bound to make a note of this letter, because so many have regarded the *Globe* as a Romantic organ without once looking into the facts of the case.

Aug. 18th, 1825. *Position of the Globe.*

In this issue of the paper, we find these words : " La centième parodie du genre sentimental et nébuleux que depuis longtemps les deux partis sifflent d'un commun accord." These words undoubtedly refer to the imaginative, mystical pieces of the modern dramatists ; yet we are told explicitly that the rival factions do not favour these productions. We think that the distinctive features of the so-called Romanticists are as vague as ever, and yet some people mention their principles. How can we then claim the *Globe* as a Romantic paper ? It expresses strong disapproval of these productions which belong to the poets who are usually called Romantic.

Sept. 13th, 1825. *Sigismond de Bourgogne.* Viennet.

The *Globe* remarks that the Pseudo-Classicists had been forced to pay attention to the natural demand for national subjects ; this demand links the Tendency with reality. As this new movement meant reality, there could be no union with the old tradition especially on the stage. The Pseudo-Classicists, however, blended the two, and claimed that imagination could override reality. This was a wrong view because the true ideal was the union of both.

Nov. 29th, 1825. *Léonidas*. Pichald. Thiers.

The author has, according to the *Globe*, succeeded in paying homage to modern qualities in a subject which dealt with the past. He succeeded because he was faithful to history; this play may be regarded as a good example of historical tragedy. Had Pichald followed the old rules, he would not have given us anything like the truth. The objection was not to the past in itself, but to its treatment without any reference to modern times. The *Globe* has never been very decided on this point, and, in many cases, its position has led to misconceptions. The key to every success on the stage is to be found, according to the critic, in the interest aroused. The *Globe* always pleads for the union of the ideal and the actual, to ensure an artistic composition. "Il ne faut jamais que dans les arts, l'invention soit au-dessous de la réalité." It was the preponderance of the imagination over the real that resulted in compositions like those of Lamartine. The critic feels sorry that Pichald failed in the last act on account of his allegiance to the old traditions. It was the custom of the *Globe* to praise an author even if he did not actually belong to the Tendency; its approbation was not confined to any particular school.

Dec. 24th, 1825. *Dramatic Unities*. Duvergier de Hauranne.

Objection was taken to the old traditions because they resulted in unnaturalness; they were widespread because they had been so long established. The critic states that there is only one unity—that of interest; but why does he complain that it is indefinite? It cannot be so because it is based upon reason, which will never submit to a set of immutable rules.

Jan. 7th, 1826. *Minor Theatres.*

We learn that a vaudeville succeeded in one of the minor theatres because it was not based on the unity of place. The *Globe* pertinently asks how much more successful it would have been, had it been a good subject. It rightly calls upon all dramatists to base their works upon reality. Comedy now held sway, and we would state that it was the only production which drew its inspiration from the world. We can go further, and state that the Tendency was only represented on the stage by the vaudeville; all its success was due to M. Scribe.

Jan. 7th, 1826. *Unities.* Duvergier de Hauranne.

These remarks are based on Manzoni's *Carmagnola*—the premier work of the Tendency in Italy. Manzoni separates the unity of action from the other two, and is opposed to limiting any action to a fixed time or place as being contrary to Nature. This blind allegiance to the rules cuts both ways; the author must leave out some interesting facts, or reject the natural sequence of those which he has chosen. This partisan feeling leads to unnaturalness, and such noble themes as Love become quite impossible. The critic denies the existence of a rule to suit all works; the difficulty lies, perhaps, in the word *règle*. There are certain general principles of art which form the basis of all works; it is in virtue of these that we can decide whether a work is artistic or not.

Jan. 14th, 1826. *Unities.* Idem.

The critic warns authors against following the old rules—a remark which serves to shew the modern ideals of the *Globe*. He makes no difference between his treatment of the vaudeville and the tragedy, provided that they are good of their kind. It would hardly have been fair

even to restrict good vaudevilles as they were the only living pieces on the stage.

Feb. 16th, 1826. *Proverbes Dramatiques.* Leclercq.
Duvergier de Hauranne.

The critic states that Beaumarchais, in his comedies, successfully described the institutions of his time, and, for this reason, we can link him with the Tendency. Molière painted the whole of society, but Régnier amused his readers. The comedy of the Pseudo-Classicists was, according to the critic, a failure because it was an imitation of the forms of Molière, and was not based upon reality. We conclude from these remarks that the bane of the past was its rules, and that authors could, like Scott and Hugo, be modern even in their treatment of Middle Age subjects. The critic congratulates the modern dramatists on introducing reality into their ideas, but he disapproves of their unnatural language—a fault of which they were guilty in all branches of literature. Even the false expressions of the writers would be conspicuous by their absence, if they were more acquainted with real life. The *Globe* is far from being favourable to these proceedings. Its position is "l'art pour l'art," not "l'art pour une école ou pour un parti." This position is further shewn in these words: "Un ouvrage d'art doit être fait pour lui-même ; il devient froid dès qu'on n'y voit qu'un moyen d'arriver à une démonstration." The three men who, in the opinion of the *Globe*, understood the comedy of the 19th century were Mérimée, Scribe, and Leclercq ; but they each had their peculiar characteristics, and did not belong to any particular school. They were modern, and that is all the connection which existed between them. The *Globe* is right in regarding the vaudeville merely as a stop-gap till something better appeared ; and, in this connection, it advises Scribe to be more of an artist, but, at the same time, not to stifle his imagination.

April 25th, 1826. *La Belle Mère et le Gendre.*
Sanson. Duvergier.

The critic states that Molière and Shakespeare attacked all the difficulties of a subject, and attained the utmost limits of the serious and the comic elements ; these compositions are noted for their virility. "If," says the critic, "the main idea of a piece becomes false, the author must have started on a wrong assumption." We notice once more the utmost horror with which all excesses inspired the *Globe*. It allows the greatest liberty to all authors within reasonable limits. This buoyancy of spirit which is ready to face all the difficulties of a subject, is remarkable among modern authors, and, though in some ways disadvantageous, is a sign of a healthy talent.

May 6th, 1826. *Mélange du tragique et du comique.*
Duvergier.

The critic quotes the example of a Pseudo-Classicist who was ready to enter into alliance with the Romantists, provided that they abjured their mystical language. The *Globe* assents to this, but regards the union of the tragical and comical elements as a *sine quâ non* of all theatrical compositions. It could not possibly recognise the existence of a well-defined modern school of literature, when it regarded one element as an essential, and another as not ; it considered rather which of the qualities was essential to the progress of true art. The critic, in the first place, objects to the separation of tragedy and comedy because it is contrary to Nature. The upholders of the old traditions took refuge behind *l'unité d'impression*, and argued that, as the tragical and the comical were contrary qualities, there could possibly be no union between them, and, strange to say, Manzoni himself was inclined to favour this view. The *Globe* dismisses the argument at once by stating that the tragical has often been the result of a comical scene. We think it impos-

sible to regard tragedy as true to Nature when it is a separate quality; we do not meet with such a case in actual life. Life is made up of diverse events, and it is quite natural to have the comical in conjunction with the tragical; the one does not exclude the other. If they meet in the character of one man, why cannot we see them in unison on the stage? The unity of impression only lasts so long as it produces interest; thus, it is no other than the unity of interest. The drama, according to the critic, is a production which paints human nature, and where the ideal does not exclude the real. In tragedy we identify ourselves with a character, but in comedy we seek amusement from it. The characters, in both cases, must be taken from Nature, so that the separation of the two *genres* is superfluous. The critic pleads for the union of these two qualities from a physical standpoint: it is not reasonable to expect human nature to respond to a succession of tragical scenes. The interest must be kept alive by interspersing the comical element; here we have another example of the sound sense of the editors. The genius of the ancients had not the picturesque leanings of the modern dramatists.

June 10th, 1826. *Suite.*

Everyone was agreed, according to the critic, to replace *the mythological* by the *historical tragedy*, but we cannot follow him when he classifies the ideal with the mythological. The *Globe* had always pleaded for the union of reality and idealism, but now it veered round. The mythological belongs to the past, but the ideal cannot be pinned down to any fixed time. The Middle Ages, in the hands of Hugo and Scott, afforded lessons for the present because they were described by men who had modern aspirations. We cannot understand the *Globe's* antipathy towards this class of productions; the only thing incompatible with modern ideas was

obedience to the old rules. The Pseudo-Classicists averred that the union of the tragical and the comical would result in confusion; the critic regards this proceeding as perfectly legitimate, provided that such is the case in Nature. He rightly clamours for a change on the stage, but he lays down no rule as to the manner in which this is to be brought about.

July 8th, 1826. *Le Vaudeville.*

Speaking of *le vaudeville*, the *Globe* gives expression to the following views, "quoiqu'on rejette encore le nom de romantisme, il s'est déjà emparé de tous les bons esprits. Nous ne nous en félicitons que par amour pour l'art et pour la vérité." The *Globe* states distinctly that whatever the doctrines of the modern poets are, it will only judge them from the point of view of art. The vaudeville, as played, could have no claim to literary merit, but it was the only channel by which reality reached the stage.

Oct. 31st, 1826. *Rosemonde.* E de Bonnechose.
P. Dubois.

The critic laid down a rule that no dramatic production could subsist on the analysis of character alone; we agree with this view, because the tendency of the age was towards reality. The painting of society, according to the *Globe*, brings in its train the consideration of the individual, and rightly so, because the individual has no claim to a separate existence apart from the general. It once more attacks the flowery language of the young authors, particularly on the stage, and it bases its remarks on the necessary union of imagination and reality. The uncertainty of the characters stamps this production as that of a young man, and this should not be regarded as a favourable opportunity of criticising the actors.

Nov. 28th, 1826. *Le Jeune Mari*. Mazères. P. Dubois.

The play in itself is of no value, but we are bound to make a note of it, as the critic mentions the general features of the pieces of the time. The inspiration is so lofty that the author expresses himself in a language which can hardly be understood; the same thing is true of the poetry of the Tendency. Contrary to the usual practice, Mazères displays a keen psychological insight, but he is too fond of affectation and antithesis. However good their poetry was, the modern authors were no dramatists.

Jan. 2nd, 1827. *L'Enthousiaste*. Léonard.

The article opens with the following words: "Nous ignorions complètement que l'enthousiasme du beau, de la liberté et des arts, fût si répandu de nos jours et que, dégénérant en manie, il dût forcer nos poètes comiques à venir nous prêcher la modération." The *Globe* upheld liberty and the propagation of true art; it did not favour any coterie. The qualities went beyond the pale of art when they became excessive; then the *Globe* ceased to take an active interest. If the Romanticists were artistic, they gained the favour of the *Globe*; but they lost it when they became inartistic. The Pseudo-Classicists were never highly spoken of because their traditions did not constitute art. Every doctrine, ancient or modern, was not synonymous with art until it proved, as Hugo puts it, "son droit de cité littéraire."

Jan. 6th, 1827. *Le Tasse*. A. Duval.

The critic remarks that the historical data have been falsified by adherence to the unities; this specific instance shews the unreasonableness of these rules. "La poésie, ce n'est pas le mensonge, c'est la résurrection du vrai"; even when individual sentiments are expressed, they must

be true, or else the individuality is lost. The rapid changes in a historical play were now made possible by the perfection of scenic art. Even before this was possible, authors had adhered to one idea, and had met with considerable success, according to the critic, because they were natural. We would differ from this view, as we rarely meet with one independent idea in Nature ; we should have to introduce its accessories, and return once more to the wider outlook mentioned above. The beauties of the piece, according to the *Globe*, have been spoilt by historical inaccuracies ; it would be an opportune moment to state that the ideal is the union of historical accuracy and imagination. Hardly one original play had appeared on the French stage during the last few years ; imitation was as rampant as ever, and it was hurtful to the progress of true literature, whether it was practised by the Romanticists or the Pseudo-Classicists. All the pieces imitated dealt with circumstances different from those of French life, so that it would be almost too much to expect the dramatists to suit them to French needs, even with tolerable success. It seemed as if the *Manes* of Ducis who always clipped the wings of the Shakesperian Muse were still making their presence felt.

March 27th, 1827. *Michelot the actor.*

The *Globe* complained that the partiality shewn to the minor theatres and their vaudevilles was injurious to the progress of true art ; the powers of the land were afraid of almost every reference on the stage of the *Théâtre Français*. The statement may be true, but this theatre had not maintained its position, and the dramatic instinct of France was only to be found in the vaudeville, however inartistic it may have been. The stage did not fulfil its purpose, because it always represented bygone ages and not modern times. The critic blames the avidity with which "historical dramas" were composed, without due regard for history ; history was the *raison-*

d'être of this drama. The advice given to those who were not historically inclined, was to write novels.

April 19th, 1827. *Les Soirées de Neuilly*. Fongery.
L. Vitet.

When an innovation began to appear in dramatic art, some of the older people, according to the critic, advised its discontinuance, because they thought that comedy did not exist in France. These forebodings were soon falsified, for modern playwrights displayed a wealth of new inspiration. Scribe is quoted as having contributed largely towards the realisation of these new principles; "qui pourra parcourir la galérie dramatique de M. Scribe sans goûter un genre de plaisir tout particulier et qu'on chercherait en vain dans notre vieux répertoire." He was, in the opinion of the *Globe*, a victim to the old traditions, and especially to the rule of the three unities. If such was the case, how did he differ from the dramatists of *la Comédie Française* who aimed at being modern through the imitation of Classical and Middle Age authors? The plays at the official theatre were not successful, while the vaudevilles of Scribe were always popular; the critic has not advanced any reason for this. We cannot agree with him that Scribe was at all ancient in his dramatic art; we would further state that it was he who kept the dramatic instinct alive in France. The *Globe* seems to regard the new movement on the stage as a sudden growth; we would state that it had undergone a slow process of evolution just as the other branches of literature. Boileau and Malherbe had laid down certain rules of art; Beaumarchais was the first to disregard them, and he was soon followed by Diderot. Even the much-maligned Ducis left the old *répertoire* to follow the example of Shakespeare. Then followed a distinct lull in the movement, but such authors as Scribe ensured its continuity.

June 23rd, 1827. *Les 30 ans.* Ducange.

The article opens with these words, "Pleurez-vous sur vos chères unités de temps et de lieu ; c'en est fait de vos productions compassées, froides et pâles. Le mélodrame les tue, le mélodrame libre et vrai, plein de vie et d'énergie." The *Globe* thus makes a distinction between the old plays and the vaudeville. How could they, however, have fixed doctrines with so many different collaborators? Here we have a case in point, where two diverse opinions are expressed on the same subject. This may be a minor consideration, but it shews that the only fixed principle of the *Globe* was just criticism in the interests of art.

July 26th, 1827. *Limite des Arts d'Imitation.* C. Magnin.

The critic pertinently asks why the *mélodrame* was more popular than the literary pieces ; but, as he gives no answer, we would state that the former was more real in that it expressed the aspirations of the age. All the remarks in this article are based upon *Le Joueur*, a comedy by Ducange. The *Globe* stands for beauty in art, and regrets the proposal that literature should have a moral aim. The statement that talent does not essentially consist of the infraction of the unities can be taken as another proof of the independence of the *Globe*. It congratulates Ducange on the realisation of modern ideals in his comedy. The mention of a gallows-bird brings the critic to a consideration of the limits of art. The artist, according to him, must present truth, but not all true things ; the reader is to derive pleasure from art. The *Globe* denies that tragedy and comedy afford the same pleasure ; we cannot agree with this division of art because it is unnatural ; it means a return to the old *régime*. The pleasure derived should be the aim of both *genres*, and, as their non-success is to be measured by the absence of interest, we cannot very well apply

different principles to both. The absence of reality from the Pseudo-Classical works must not incline us to the belief that *la vérité* is the only aim of the dramatist. The critic would have materially contributed towards the solution of the difficulty, had he stated that imagination constituted the missing link. We are told that no dramatist can ever hope to reproduce all the beauties of life, and that he must take some examples from the type which is represented in himself. The position of the *Globe* on this question is clear enough; it does not believe in Art apart from Nature. We also notice the perfect unison of the general and particular elements as laid down by Hegel and Bonald. Excessive reality is every whit as blameworthy as inordinate mysticism; the *Globe* steers a purely middle course. The desire for human blood, as exemplified in the Roman gladiatorial contests and in the Spanish bull-fights, can never, on this score, have an artistic effect. The critic is hardly correct in saying that the duty of the dramatist is to fix our attention on one idea; his work is to present Nature, not only in its diverse forms, but also stamped with the impress of his own individuality.

Sept. 6th, 1827. *Émilia*. A. Soumet.

The success of this play shews the high opinion which people had of the works of Scott, and offers an example of the influence of foreign literatures on French thought. It is, however, difficult to state whether Soumet was ancient or modern. He conformed with the old tradition by adhering to the unity of place; he has disfigured the work of Scott by confining the action to one place. On the other hand, he has kept the characters of Scott, and has introduced a few historical details. This work, which seems to combine the features of the old and new tendencies, is judged on its literary merits. The introduction of the old traditions on the stage,

under modern conditions, naturally ended in failure, and the *Globe*, as usual, entered a strong protest against this proceeding.

Oct. 30th, 1827. *L'homme du Monde*. Anon.

The *Globe* makes the following statement with regard to the melodrama; "il manque à tout ce qu'on appelle mélodrames bien autre chose que le style. Il leur manque la hauteur des vues, la vraisemblance des incidents, la vérité des caractères, l'exactitude historique et, par-dessus tout, cet idéal nécessaire à toutes les productions des arts." The melodrama shews the desire for theatrical emotions; a desire which can be regarded as a characteristic of the 19th century. In short, it was a living force, and, as there was no life in the other plays, we must feel indebted to these authors for ensuring the continuity of the movement which started far back in the preceding century; we make this remark without any reference to the literary excellence of the *genre*. These are its features as noticed by the *Globe*, "les combinaisons les plus romanesques, l'exagération la plus folle, la barbarie du style." We claim these productions, with all their faults, as some sort of expression of the ideals of the age. The plays of the Romanticists which possessed these same faults in a lesser degree, must be placed on a higher level of literary excellence, but we do not care for the manner in which the *Globe* ignores these qualities. The passion for novelty, coupled with the mysticism of the age, produced such works as the *Jeanne D'Arc* of Soumet. The critic sees some sort of melodrama in such a work as *Hans d'Islande*, but we perceive no reason for this division of the *genre*, as both arose from the desire for rapid action. The *Globe* objects to the statement that the historical drama is derived from the melodrama. We cannot possibly regard them as purely alike, on account of the vast artistic superiority of the former. In the historical drama, *le mélange des*

genres serves to relieve the monotony of the action. We do not regard this as the ultimate reason ; the dramatist was forced to it if he desired to be natural. . Where do we stand with regard to the melodrama? Here again the inspiration must be taken from real life ; where then does the difference come in? The historical drama displays the greatest harmony of reality and imagination, while the melodrama gives us crude reality without any artistic effect. Their essence is the same, but they differ from the artistic point of view.

Dec. 6th, 1827. *Cromwell*. Hugo.

The critic congratulates Hugo on leaving the beaten paths, and following his own inspiration. The *Globe* admits that *le grotesque* was Hugo's own idea ; objection is taken to his passion for the Middle Ages as not being in harmony with modern ideals. We have more than once called attention to the views of the *Globe* on this question, so that there is no need to go into details again.

Dec. 8th, 1827. *Mariage d'Argent*. Scribe.

Strange to say, this piece was played at the *Comédie Française*. The critic states that Scribe, after changing his locale, was not able to leave his old groove ; the example of Scott is quoted in support of this view. No explanation whatever is offered of this phenomenon ; we think that it is another instance of the intense individualism of the age. It would be very difficult to claim the *Globe* as a romantic organ, for there was no such thing in existence as a Romantic School. The *Globe* remarks that, when everybody was tired of the inane plays of the Empire, Scribe introduced *la comédie-vaudeville*. His works could not aspire to the name of comedy, and yet the critic acknowledged his talent in this direction. This compliment was well deserved, because, after all, he kept the embers alight.

Jan. 26th, 1828. *Cromwell*. V. Hugo. C. Magnin.

The system of Hugo, in the main, finds favour with the editors of the *Globe*, but their criticism is unbiassed. They are careful to deny their allegiance to any school; they regard the poet as an individual, and not as a member of a coterie. "Quoique ses idées sur l'art différent peu des nôtres, quoique son ouvrage ait été conçu dans le système dramatique qui nous paraît destiné à renouveler l'avenir de notre théâtre; Hugo répond de lui seul. Il faudrait aussi accepter ce qui se rencontre de bizarre dans ses inventions, de faux dans ses vues, d'affecté dans son style; et le plus sûr comme le plus juste est de n'attribuer qu'à lui les qualités et les défauts de son talent (not those of any system). Quoique Hugo soit ce qu'on appelle aujourd'hui romantique, nous le jugerons avec un entier désintéressement, nous le jugerons comme un autre." Hugo was both a poet and a critic; this had become necessary, because the theory that the poet was the creature of the imagination, not amenable to reason, had been exploded owing to the progress of the Tendency. As the poet could not be modern without being real, he could not afford to neglect the practical side of his art; it is here that criticism steps in. The bane of French literature, in the opinion of the *Globe*, was the attention paid to style at the expense of ideas, and the dramatist could avoid this calamity by becoming a philosopher and a historian. The *Globe* complained that Hugo's style was full of strange expressions, though agreeing that the drama had to be inspired by Nature. It takes no further notice of this failing which is peculiar to modern writers. The critic regards modern art as purely dramatic because it expresses the aspirations of the age; we would deny this *in toto*, as it is a recognised fact that the plays were failures owing to the absence of this quality. The words in which Hugo traces the chequered career of the Muse through the centuries are quoted in full; he would

have been more successful, had he considered the different phases of poetry in the light of the age in which they were produced, instead of laying down a hard and fast rule. "Il serait difficile d'exprimer, d'une façon brève et complète, la différence fondamentale de la poésie antique à la poésie moderne ; mais on peut, du moins, saisir en passant quelques-uns des caractères qui distinguent l'une de l'autre." The *Globe* acknowledges the impossibility of forming a fixed idea of modern literature ; it contents itself with grasping the general principles of art, and even these cannot form the basis of a school of poetry. A fine distinction is drawn between the *comical* and the *grotesque* ; comedy is a satire upon our weaknesses ; the grotesque is the exaggeration of this satire. Hugo is certainly at fault when he states that the ancients were not acquainted with the grotesque ; we would refer those who are inclined to agree with him to *The Frogs* of Aristophanes. The prevalence of this quality is said to have arisen from the growing simplicity of society ; this simplicity was individualistic in its bearings. Too much attention was paid to this feature, so that it went beyond the limits of art, and fell under the ban of the *Globe*. The ideal position was to consider the *grotesque* in its connection with the other features which went to form a character. Such a quality had languished in France because of the widespread existence of ideas which aimed at a uniform type of beauty, and which excluded every unpleasant element. Hugo practised *le mélange des genres* and historical accuracy ; he expressed them in the usual flowery language, though his versification was well-nigh perfect. *Cromwell* is, historically, a travesty of facts ; Hugo painted his characters in this manner in order to make full use of antithesis—a proceeding which was contrary to Nature. The piece could not be played on the stage on account of its length. Amidst the multiplicity of details, says the critic, the action is lost sight of. Under those circumstances, the interest is lost, and the play ends in failure. We do not think that

the work is very dramatic ; it reads well, but there is too much poetry about it. The modern drama in prose was not, as yet, a success. The stilted language of the Classical tragedy would not suit modern readers. The reason, which the *Globe* does not mention, is that the new condition of society required a new language to express its aspirations. For some reason or other, Frenchmen regarded verse as necessary to tragedy, "Et de même que nous trouvons dans le passé le germe de tant de vérités qui n'ont pris que de nos jours leur développement et leur force, ne pourrions-nous rencontrer dans les ouvrages des maîtres de l'art les indices qu'il faut suivre pour innover après eux et comme eux?" The critic suggests that writers could find a *modus vivendi* of style, as comedy and tragedy were but artificially separated. The *Globe* regards this as the reason for the innovations of the modern writers, and this is what we did when we traced the history of the Tendency. The critic points out the difficulty of introducing common everyday words into the stilted style of tragedy, but the only way to avoid this is to neglect everything which does not lend itself to poetic expression. Poetry must have a place in the drama because it introduces the requisite amount of imagination. The *Globe* is very candid in its criticism, "Si ce n'est pas un bon ouvrage, c'est une admirable étude."

Feb. 6th, 1828. *Mort de Tibère*. Arnault. P. Dubois.

The *Globe* cannot understand the value of the old traditions in the analysis of a complex character ; these artificial rules serve no real purpose ; the dramatist simply requires imagination and insight into human nature. The critic deplored the fact that dramatists did not possess the power of invention, and this failing, coupled with the contempt for history, caused the poverty of the stage. This artificiality affected the actors in that they grew unaccustomed to the expression of real sentiments.

Feb. 20th, 1828. *Amy Robsart.*

The object of these dramatists, according to the critic, was to surpass the imitators of Scott. They attempted to create a new language for the stage; it is so full of unusual expressions that it becomes unnatural; we then conclude that they were members of the Tendency. Our contention is strengthened by the fact that they made a deliberate attempt to be peculiar, especially as they were men of undoubted imaginative powers. There are some grounds for the belief, apart from this article, that Hugo was one of the authors of this play. The *Globe* was severe on the Romanticists, but its criticism was given in the interests of Art. Can we not see a reference, in the following words, to the usual style of criticism, and especially to that which favoured a particular school, "nous ne savons guère de drames, à grand succès, à qui leurs prôneurs osassent donner la moitié de cet éloge"?

March 1st, 1828. *Les Soirées de Neuilly.* Fongeray.

We are told that the dramatist succeeded in doing what few of his predecessors had done, namely, in reproducing historical facts without any inventions of his own. The *Globe* was not much in favour of the excessive lyricism which was so rampant, but we must state that its desires, with regard to a real historical drama without the influence of imagination, were too idealistic, though Fongeray seems to have met with some measure of success on the present occasion. We would, however, examine the case in point. He had to introduce a dialogue between the characters, and this was impossible unless he used his artistic powers. The *Globe* has thus gone a little too far in its praise, because the historical drama would be too positive and uniform, were it based upon fact alone.

March 15th, 1828. *Le Vaudeville et son influence sur la littérature.*

Boileau, when he said "le Français, né malin, créa le vaudeville," meant a sort of satirical song which took off peculiar characters; the vaudeville of the 19th century was quite a different thing. We are told that it was unnatural in that it combined music and poetry. The vaudeville was, at first, restricted to allegorical characters, then it followed in the wake of comedy by satirising the faults of the age. The critic objected to this usurpation, but we would remark that the vaudeville came in when comedy was no longer successful; its very success justified its existence. The *Globe* did not, however, pay much attention to the value of literary *genres*, "tous les genres sont bons, je n'en proscriis aucun"; neither did it favour unbridled liberty. It agreed with Hugo that every author should study his subject, and evolve the rules which he meant to follow; there was to be no convention, "je veux que les genres soient fidèles aux règles qu'ils tiennent de leur nature même." The critic is also in favour of the individuality of writers in that he allows them to adapt a subject to the needs of their talent. The vaudeville did great harm, the critic states, to literature; firstly, by taking actors away from comedy; secondly, by removing dramatists from their proper sphere; thirdly, by satiating the public with poor plays. It seems to us that he has not dealt fairly with the question; we shall now proceed to consider these charges. Real comedy had been lying dormant for some time, but, thanks to the strenuous efforts of the young dramatists, there was every hope of a revival. The traditions of the *Théâtre Français* were against any such originality, so the poets had to turn where their talents would be appreciated; it was thus that they threw in their lot with the minor theatres. Comedy was too artistic for the habitués of these theatres, so that the playwrights had no alternative but to compose

vaudevilles. Whatever opinion one may have about the literary value of these productions, we must admit that they assured the continuity of the French stage. These vaudevilles shewed that the masses had a just appreciation of what was required in a play—a faithful representation of real life. We should naturally expect the *Globe* to prefer a vaudeville to a piece based upon the old traditions. We agree with the critic that there was now no room for the vaudeville, because this new movement in literature was supplying a long-felt want. We must, however, admit that the vaudeville had contributed largely to the realisation of this new state of things.

March 19th, 1828. *Charles II.* Duval.

Duval was, according to the critic, placed at a disadvantage because he had imitated Scott. The historical matter of the work consists merely of a few names, and he has taken one solitary incident from the history as laid down by Scott. The practice of mutilating the work of another writer is condemned, not only as contrary to the spirit of true literature, but also as a breach of good taste.

March 29th, 1828. *Les Soirées de Neuilly.* Fongerey.
L. Vitet.

The appearance of this work was hailed with delight because it marked the final separation from the traditions of the past, and gave a faithful representation of the 19th century. Fongerey happily blends the pathetic and the mirthful. The *Globe* sounds a note of warning against the practice of mistaking the epigram for comedy; we would attribute this confusion to the effects of the sharp struggles in literature and politics. The imagination of Fongerey fills up the *lacunæ* left by the facts, but the whole work appeals to the critic more as a homely conversation. The author would have

done better, according to the *Globe*, had he judiciously allowed his imagination to go further. History tells us what men did, but the drama should tell us also what they thought.

May 3rd, 1828. *Élisabeth de France*. A. Soumet.
P. Dubois.

We would quote the comparison by means of which Dubois expresses his opposition to imitations of all kinds. He likens the imitator to a wandering Arab who pitches his tent under the shadow of an imposing pyramid ; he is not inspired by its majestic appearance, and his only thought is for room enough to fix his habitation. The imitator must needs mutilate every piece—a proceeding which is opposed to the true conception of Art. Dubois gives another reason why most modern plays had ended in failure : " Il est temps que les comédiens y songent et, s'ils n'y songent pas, il est temps que le privilège tombe, pour le salut de l'art."

July 5th, 1828. *Minor Theatres*.

The *Globe* lays down the rule that history cannot be fancifully treated on the stage ; this is the correct view to take, but we can hardly expect a high ideal of art in these *théâtres de boulevard*. It also states that history, and consequently the stage, must not further the interests of any party. If the theatre was to be a living power, it had to rest on modern aspirations. We cannot apply the epithet *true* to a play unless the characters are true to Nature. The critic seems to think that the use of the epithet is justifiable if only the facts exist. Neither do we see any reason why the characters of a piece which fulfils all the conditions of *la vérité* should not represent a whole period of time.

July 5th, 1828. *Charles II*. Duval. Sainte-Beuve.

Duval gives his view of the Romantic Movement : " Il s'en est suivi que de nos jours tout vise à l'originalité,

au bizarre ; que la vraisemblance et la raison sont bannies et qu'à force de chercher la vérité, on arrive au trivial pour tomber bientôt dans l'absurde." Naturally enough, modern dramatists aimed at originality and truth ; their works succeeded because they were living representations of the present. It seems to us that this one consideration does away with the stigma of unreality. No doubt many of the works were somewhat florid in expression, but the writers did not proceed on the lines laid down by Duval. These particular authors did not start from the standpoint of *la vérité* ; they failed because they neglected this quality at the outset. Duval again remarks : " Les jeunes gens, égarés par les prédicateurs des nouvelles doctrines, ne sachant plus quelle est la meilleure route, de celle qu'ont suivie nos pères ou de celle qu'on leur indique, se bornent, en attendant la solution du problème, à faire des vaudevilles, ou à mettre de petits articles dans les journaux littéraires." This view is entirely erroneous, because modern writers were too independent to espouse any system ; they followed their own inspiration on every occasion. They entirely abjured the ways of their predecessors, and took up the vaudeville simply because there was nothing better ; far from losing their dignity, they were keeping up the only vestige of life left in French literature. Duval was too much enamoured of the past to give a disinterested critique ; this passion blinded him to the excellence of foreign literatures. Modern writers did not, as he seemed to think, copy foreign works wholesale, but only regarded them as subsidiary to their own inspirations. This has always been the position of the *Globe* ; furthermore, it objects to imitation in every shape and form. Sainte-Beuve recognises the indifference displayed by the masses towards the theatre, and states that the Pseudo-Classicists attributed the failure of their plays to this cause. The older writers, however, saw that they were, to a large extent, responsible for this state of things. The critic proceeds to consider the causes which prevented the realisation of

modern ideals on the stage. The works based upon the old traditions were not, according to the critic, consonant with the state of French society, as every vestige of authority, social and otherwise, had been swept away. The prevalence of political ideas accounted largely for this state of affairs; Art had to be supplemented by meditation which was free from egotism before the Tendency could be fully realised. The *Globe* also had its ideal; "L'art, retiré du tourbillon, tracera dans la solitude son œuvre pacifique qu'il animera *de toutes les couleurs de la vie*; cette œuvre où viendront sans doute se confondre, en mille effets charmants ou sublimes, *la vérité et l'idéal, la raison et la fantaisie, l'observation des hommes, le rêve du poète.*" Neither did the critic blame the public for favouring inspiration taken from the present, and not from the past—the one feature in which the *Globe* agreed with modern dramatists. It changes its point of view when it praises Scribe and his vaudevilles. The *Globe* did not like the sickly sentimentalism of some authors; it preferred a vaudeville, however inartistic it might be. Neither was there a dearth of talent; we cannot claim any particular feature as belonging entirely to the 19th century, because all authors followed their own bent; all we can say of them is that they were perfectly modern.

Aug. 6th, 1828. *École de Jeunesse.* Draparnaud.
C. Magnin.

The *Globe* recognises the faults of modern writers, and goes so far as to state that men who had been through such struggles must necessarily possess uncommon qualities. Our opinion is that the criticism of the *Globe* was severe for this very reason. It once more proclaims its position of independence; "Nous ne sommes pas encore assez loin de la jeunesse pour pouvoir professer librement pour elle cette partialité indulgente que peut lui témoigner un autre âge; il y aurait de la fatuité à nous constituer ses apologistes."

Oct. 29th, 1828. *Wallstein*. Liadières. P. Dubois.

Here we have an imitation of the famous play of Schiller, and, as such, it was not likely to command success. Even B. Constant, who possessed a rare talent, did not meet with signal success when he took the same subject. The critic deplores this imitation, but his argument proceeds on distinctly novel lines. He asks how French people would like to see the beauties of *Athalie* mutilated by a German or English writer? Why not apply the same principle to foreign literatures? "Guerre donc, guerre à mort, à tous ces drames allemands ou anglais rabougris qui souillent notre scène." Imitation, according to the *Globe*, is hurtful to the public and to the poets themselves. The masses had not yet forsaken their love for the old tradition; the passages which they applauded in this play were entirely based on Classical models.

Nov. 26th, 1828. *Marie de Brabant*. Ancelot.
C. Magnin.

Ancelot produced, according to the critic, a drama based upon two contradictory principles (the ancient and the modern), and, therefore, could command no success. Criticism was dependent upon poetry for its existence. Ancelot should have followed his inclinations, and not calculated what was prudent; the one thing which appealed to all was a strong personality. The critic protested against the old system, because Art rested on a personal basis. Now that criticism had cleared away the relics of the past, there was an open field for talent. The *Globe* remarks that, as the public became more Romantic, Ancelot increased the number of his innovations. We disagree with this view because it savours of the idea of a system; he happened to live in an age which possessed these Romantic leanings, and this is the reason why he took such a course. The critic

blames him for separating the theatre from Nature, and attributes his failure to this one fact. Soumet, Guiraud, C. Delavigne, and Ancelot are blamed for their imaginative productions; we may well extend the same remarks to the followers of *la Muse Française*. However florid their language was, we do not think that they ever had any intention of following Racine, as the critic seems to think. He groups Ancelot with these poets, and yet states that he does not follow Racine; surely there is some inconsistency here. The *Globe* does not agree with the idea of regarding the Romantic Tendency as a uniform system; it explicitly states that some authors desired to compose the historical drama in poetry, and others in prose. Prose was superior to the poetry of the Pseudo-Classicists in that it brought the truth to light. It served a useful purpose in expressing *la vérité*, but the reader himself was left to distinguish the personal element. The critic was dissatisfied with this view because he thought that the masses could not perceive the ideal in the garb of the real. He states that the theatre should possess a higher development of *la vérité* than ordinary language; but, for all that, every play must be based upon fact. If prose was once successful, it meant that the public, by its appreciation of the ideal, possessed strong powers of discrimination. Speaking from our limited knowledge of the average French playgoer as exemplified at the *Théâtre Français*, we would state that he displayed a just appreciation of the ideal when blended with reality. If this is possible at the present day, we see no reason for supposing that such was not the case in 1828. We quote this example because the play referred to is *Hernani*—the type of the drama of the Tendency. By its advocacy of this higher reality on the stage, the *Globe* slightly countenances the works which cannot be understood on account of their intense idealism. It is, however, only a matter of degree; in the main, the *Globe* still favours the union of the real and the ideal. The modern dramatists,

according to the *Globe*, pleaded for a new language because they had new ideas to express. This statement simply means that writers stamped their own individuality on the language; it meant no revolutionary change. Hugo created a new language, and yet he can be quoted as an example of grammatical accuracy. The *Globe* sets its face against the traditions of the past, and its constructive policy with regard to the Tendency ends there. As the Tendency is pure individualism, the *Globe* can do nothing more than leave it an open question. "La querelle du romantisme commença par une question de style; ce fut Atala qui la fit naître; depuis elle s'est étendue et agrandie, et, après avoir parcouru le cercle, elle revient au point de départ." All the authors follow their own bent, and, as it were, run off at a tangent to the circle. We regard this circle as consisting of modern ideals and their necessary consequent—*l'individualisme*. The critic did not intend maintaining a neutral position between those who favoured prose, and those who wrote in verse; this view may, at first glance, seem to refute the independence of the *Globe*. It will be noticed that it is not going to be neutral with regard to a particular feature of the Tendency—reform of the language. We must also note here that there is no question of the distinction between the old and the young authors, but between different features of the new movement in literature.

Feb. 4th, 1829. *Lancastre*. D'Épagny. C. Magnin.

The Tendency had now reached high-water mark in France, and, according to the critic, the friends of D'Épagny were continually repeating the words *innovation, école nouvelle*, in order to ensure the success of the play. We are told that it was a compromise between the ancient and the modern, and, as such, could not be very successful. The *Globe* contemptuously refers to

"les lieux communs du théâtre romantique." "Les lieux communs de toutes les écoles ne seront jamais que des lieux communs, et ceux-ci n'ont pas même sur notre scène le mérite de la nouveauté." The *Globe* is not willing to regard innovation as the feature of any school; it rejects the idea as opposed to the dictates of Art. The critic was surprised that writers used stilted language in their descriptions of everyday events, while they became commonplace when there was need for exalted language.

Feb. 7th, 1829. *Plays of Arnault*. Duchâtel.

The critic, in his account of the influence of Ossian, mentions the differences between the modern and the Pseudo-Classical literature. He would have enhanced the value of his criticism by stating that this particular phenomenon contributed towards the growth of the Tendency, and that even Arnault did not escape its influence. Arnault found the material for a tragedy in one of Ossian's ballads. This proceeding was impracticable because it meant the expression of a modern inspiration under old forms.

Feb. 14th, 1829. *Henri III. et sa cour*. A. Dumas.
C. Magnin.

This piece was not an imitation, but was perfectly modern. The *Globe* did not agree with the choice of subject, as the period chosen was not fit for representation. It agrees with Hugo in placing a limit on reality ("la réalité selon l'art"), and indirectly offers a safeguard against the cult of the fantastic. We see no reason why the dramatist should not have a free choice of subject; if he is an artist, he will certainly keep within the proper limits. Historical accuracy seems to have been impossible under these circumstances. Dumas has mingled two parallel stories; he has made the nobility act like

the lower stratum of society. The one redeeming feature of the play, according to the critic, is the interest aroused. Dumas was possessed of a dramatic instinct which he always followed; he belonged to no school. We can apply these words to all the Romantic writers; their instinct was for the modern in all things. Dumas did not have sufficient personality to lead a literary movement. We would call special attention to the tactics of the Pseudo-Classicists. Whenever a modern play succeeded, they composed parodies, and played them on the stage, hoping thus to stem the tide of success by means of obloquy. This play was parodied in a vaudeville entitled *la Cour du Roi Pétaud*, and many more followed in its train.

March 26th, 1829. *Minor Theatres.*

The directors of the minor theatres saw that they would lose their popularity unless they catered for the public. People were beginning to look in a new direction; they required reality as expressed in history. The censor, however, deleted any passages which he did not like, so that these plays, instead of being purely historical, gave nothing but a travesty of facts. We would quote this as an example of the influence of the censor on the stage; he was there entirely in the interests of the Pseudo-Classicists.

July 25th, 1829. *New Play by Hugo.*

The play referred to here is, presumably, *Hernani*. Our attention is drawn to the weak attempts made to popularise the stage once more. The *Globe* states that *Le Comité de Lecture* of the *Comédie Française* had accepted this new piece of V. Hugo. In spite of this momentary success, there existed a strong undercurrent of opposition which was soon to break out. The existence of this opposition was rightly regarded as a menace to the liberty of the stage.

Aug. 5th, 1829. *Démétrius*. Halévy.

The *Globe* admits the defeat of the old rules, and warns old writers against the servile imitation of foreign modern works. In answer to the critics who desired to know its views, it replied, "Notre œuvre, c'est la ruine des traditions"; thus it does not support any literary coterie. The critic, however, would very much like to behold the appearance of a masterpiece on the French stage. He acknowledged the existence of a renovation in literature—one which was characterised by absolute freedom. Halévy was blamed for not making himself so well acquainted with his subject that he could give us a faithful representation thereof; this view is a phase of the cult of *la vérité* which the *Globe* always followed. We cannot understand the *Globe's* position at this juncture; on this occasion, it advised Halévy to group the facts of the play together so as to bring out the character of the hero; usually, it demanded naturalness before everything. Facts, when strained to suit a particular purpose, become artificial. Another common failing manifests itself; the stage was not the place to declaim lyric poetry. A reference is made to the decadence of acting, and a plea is entered for a higher level of excellence in this matter, as it was necessary to the progress of dramatic art.

Aug. 15th, 1829. *The Censor and Hugo*.

A reference is made to the censor's refusal to allow Hugo's play to be represented. The *Globe* enters a strong protest against this breach of confidence, and appeals to all the friends of liberty to resist this attack, which was, in our opinion, a new move on the part of the Pseudo-Classicists. Hugo appeals to the King, who is strongly opposed to any mention of Royalty on the stage. The poet is very independent, and refuses a pension at His Majesty's hands.

Oct. 17th, 1829. *Christine à Fontainebleau.* Soulié.
C. Magnin.

The critic not only objects to the Classical Tradition, but also states that it is not based upon religion. It seems that the dramatists who failed on account of their adherence to the past, blamed the playgoers for not being able to appreciate their works; the fact of the matter was that the masses would have nothing but modern plays. In the opinion of the *Globe*, the commonplace of the past was no worse than that of modern times. It regards this work as a pure melodrama, and blames Soulié for his historical anachronisms; others affirmed that it was *un drame fantastique*. We are given to understand that this *genre* reached the truth by way of the absurd, while the melodrama forsook truth, and took up the absurd. Shakespeare, according to the critic, mingled a few facts with the fantastic, and thus satisfied the demands of *la vérité*. The *Globe* quotes this as an almost perfect example of the union of truth and imagination. The melodrama of the French stage could hardly be called absurd; it was very realistic, and, sometimes, went beyond the limits of good taste. We think it strange that the *Globe* did not deal fairly with these productions; they must be regarded as inartistic, but they were the nearest approach to reality on the French stage, and, as such, should have been encouraged. Neither can we agree to call this play a melodrama; it is rather, as the friends of Soulié thought, the production of a youthful author.

Oct. 17th, 1829. *Hugo and Vigny.* C. Magnin.

The editors call attention to a rumour that *Hernani* was to take precedence over *l'Othello* of De Vigny. They did not pay much attention to the practice of dividing French writers into two schools; neither did they trouble about the signification of the terms applied

to the two factions. "Si le chef des pygmées romantiques a des amis plus éclairés que le chef des géants classiques." A distinction is made even between the authors of the so-called Romantic School. An appeal is made in favour of a faithful translation of Shakespeare, because it would serve to shew the direction which the drama was to take now that the old traditions had been swept away. These remarks shew that the *Globe* had no system, but that it urged people to find out what would best suit the needs of the times. The critic also supported the claims of De Vigny because he saw that another struggle would be the result of this favouritism; he thus displayed his solicitude for the true progress of Art. The *Globe* demands a fair trial in order that it may compare this piece with the Classical models, and come to a definite conclusion.

Oct. 21st, 1829. *Hernani*.

In this issue of the *Globe* we find the following communication from V. Hugo:—

"Paris,
18 Octobre 1829.

Monsieur,

Je comprendrais fort bien que toujours, et quelle que fût la date de sa réception, *Othello* passât avant *Hernani*; mais *Hernani* avant *Othello*, jamais. Vous m'obligerez de publier ce peu de lignes.

J'ai l'honneur etc.

'L'auteur de *Hernani*.'

This letter proves that modern authors, in spite of all their differences, were endeavouring to found a *genre* worthy of the French stage. This idle rumour is another example of the jealousy which followed the Tendency in some quarters.

Oct. 28th, 1829. *Le More de Venise.* De Vigny.
C. Magnin.

De Vigny is congratulated on giving a faithful translation of the work of Shakespeare without mutilating it, as was then the custom. It is interesting to note that the *Globe* protests against the manœuvres of the Pseudo-Classicists, and more interesting still is the statement that it sides with De Vigny purely on account of his originality. Hatred of the past and its methods made the *Globe* modern, but not one word was breathed about supporting the doctrines of the modern poets. This piece was hailed as a modest attempt to create a new language for the stage. The critic regretted that even this attempt had not solved the question of the ideal drama, but he did not account for the failure. We would suggest that it was impossible to have one irreproachable type, because the distinctive feature of the movement was individualism, and, therefore, there could only be certain general principles. As is well pointed out, the French alexandrine was the union of prose and verse; it was only suited to the expression of noble sentiments, but Shakespeare had to blend poetry and naturalness; we can, therefore, appreciate the difficulties which De Vigny had to face. As a result of this, some went in for reality minus poetry, while others turned everything into verse. The view taken by the critic is justifiable, as we meet with both classes among the young dramatists; this may be adduced as a proof that we cannot realise the existence of one modern school of poetry.

Dec. 9th, 1829. *Élisabeth d'Angleterre.*

The *Globe* once more affirms its independence, "en philosophie, l'éclectisme est cette méthode large et de bon sens qui cherche le vrai et le montre. Chercher le beau, soit pour en jouir, soit pour en évaluer en ce genre

la part de chaque pays, de chaque âge, de chaque artiste, tel est l'éclectisme de la critique, ou plutôt, l'éclectisme est la critique même." We have also denied the existence of any system, because it would clash with our view of individualism ; there were, however, certain general principles which united them. The *Globe* expresses itself as follows : "L'originalité implique l'unité." It also had a deep-rooted objection to regarding the modern writers as a school, "Qu'il se forme une société d'artistes qui prétendent accoupler et amalgamer divers genres, de manière à faire sortir de ce mélange je ne sais quel art, je ne sais quelle poésie métisse, c'est du métier, c'est de la barbarie." Though not in favour of any system, the critic regrets that some modern productions were absolutely colourless ; he attributes this weakness to the isolation of the authors from the world. We would again state that he is most individualistic who knows his fellows, and can reproduce their aspirations.

Jan. 13th, 1830. *Clovis*. Lemer cier. C. Magnin.

The *Globe* calls attention to the practice of taking an abstract truth as the basis of a play ; it seemed to be a favourite plan of writers who possessed no originality, as it was a convenient way of copying other people's ideas, and clothing them in a somewhat different garb. It lays down two principles for the philosophical drama ; firstly, the ideas were to be new ; secondly, there was to be freedom for historical development. This is a straightforward statement with regard to all plays ; herein lies the combination of the real and the ideal.

Feb. 25th, 1830. *Hernani*. V. Hugo. C. Magnin.

The article opens with a statement of the position of the *Globe*. "Nous ne comptons ni parmi les détracteurs de Victor Hugo. On le sait ; malgré notre penchant pour tous ceux qui sortent des routes battues, nous lui

avons été plutôt sévères que favorables, juges froids et mesurés des beautés et des défauts de ses ouvrages. Quand il y avait combat sur chacun d'eux, d'une part enthousiasme, d'autre part dépréciation ennemie, nous avons tenu à exprimer, en dehors de la lutte, notre impression, ce que nous avons cru la vérité." The critic refuses to judge the play before its representation, so as to be quite free from prejudice. He also protests against the manœuvres of the Pseudo-Classicists who persecuted Hugo out of pure spite. Copies and parodies of the play were in vogue even before its representation; a strong protest is entered against this breach of confidence on the part of some one unknown. The *Globe* hoped that this occurrence would cause the fall of the censorship, and remarked that this blind enmity enhanced the reputation of Hugo. It once more defines its position, "Les amis de l'art, ceux qui, comme nous, cherchent dans tous les systèmes ce qu'ils ont de bon et de beau, ne seront point troublés dans leur étude consciencieuse." It strikes a note of true disinterestedness, and protests against every form of prejudice as injurious to the progress of true art, "Nous serons en garde contre nos amitiés; que les autres soient en garde contre leurs préjugés ou leurs engagements de parti." Hugo himself quotes a passage from the works of Alaya, the historian of Pedro the Cruel; as the play is based upon this passage, we can be sure of its historical accuracy as a whole.

March 1st, 1830. *Hernani*. V. Hugo. C. Magnin.

The critic hails the appearance of this play as foreboding the dissolution of the old traditions, and the realisation of modern ideals. This article was written to refute the statements of a certain critic who asserted that, as dramatic innovation of every description was impossible in France, Hugo did not represent a change. Another critic denied that *Hernani* was a drama of the 19th century, though acknowledging the undoubted

talent of Hugo. The *Globe* did not regard it as the drama of the 19th century or as the *ne plus ultra* of human achievement; all it did say was that Hugo afforded a new source of inspiration. It thus supports our view that there existed a new movement in French literature, and that it was impossible to attribute a definite form to it, as it arose from the individuality of the writers; the one feature of the *Globe* was innovation in all its branches. The proof of the modern inspiration of the *Globe* is to be found, according to the critic, in the impressions of the readers themselves. The 17th century plays appealed to sentiment and reason, but Hugo took possession of the imaginative faculties of his readers as well. Everything in this world is only relatively true; the play is true as a whole, though its different sections seem disconnected and, therefore, false. Rousseau was imaginative in a restricted sense, according to the *Globe*; Hugo, on the other hand, carried this gift to its utmost limits. The continuity of the Tendency is acknowledged, and, more important still, an example is given of its slow, though decided, evolution. The critic quotes *Atala* as an example of the same principle, and states that, even in Chateaubriand's time, the distinction between the Romanticists and the Pseudo-Classicists was patent to everyone. No mention is made of Madame de Staël and Lamartine as members of the Tendency. The works based upon imagination flourished, but the theatre was in a state of decadence owing to the deep-rooted influence of the old traditions. We have more than once stated that the young dramatists were too fond of declamation on the stage; this was one of the reasons for the failure of *Hernani*. We disagree with the critic that the scene at the tomb of Charlemagne is not effective; it appeals to us even more than the ever-famous scene where *Don Ruy Gomez* displayed the portraits of his ancestors. The *Globe* states that the interest languishes at times, and the reason, which unfortunately he does not give, is that

there is too much poetry, and too little action. The critic was justified in calling attention to the numerous unlikely situations in the piece; we would quote the passage where, amidst the stillness of the night, after all the guests had departed, *Don Ruy Gomez* sounds his horn; the most glaring example of this is the melodramatic ending of the play.

March 12th. *Idem.*

The *Globe* calls attention to the decadence of poetry, and claims that such a contingency is favourable to criticism in that it allows the critic to evolve his own ideas. When Art is supreme, the rôle of the critic becomes more restricted; his only duty is to consider the works of others. This was the history of France, and particularly of the *Globe* at this time. People were of the opinion that imagination was an attribute of isolation, but Hugo dismissed the idea by introducing it on the stage in all its glory; the result was the revolt of the so-called reasonable men. The *Globe* now admits that its objections to the historical inaccuracies were somewhat extreme; this confession shews a change of front, for, in past years, it did not admit the existence of a purely imaginative work. Our own impressions of the play were pretty much the same; we enjoyed the declamation of the numerous beautiful passages in spite of their undoubted unreality. Hugo has introduced his inordinate love of antithesis which affords yet another reason for the failure of the piece. The Pseudo-Classicalists do not come in for all the blame, as modern writers are severely censured for attempting to stifle criticism; this statement proves that the *Globe* was no respecter of persons. No greater proof of the success of *Hernani* is required than the fact that, in nearly all the minor theatres, plays based upon it were represented; it was, besides, the absorbing theme of conversation in the salons.

April 2nd, 1830. *Stockholm, Fontainebleau, Rome.*
A. Dumas. C. Magnin.

Dumas decided to shew *Christine*, the queen, as a statue which could be seen from all sides; he was obliged to do this, because the crisis did not last long. The play, according to the critic, is simple biography, and not history. Dumas lost much of his power by failing to have a clear conception of what he was going to do. He can be ranked among the authors of the Tendency because of his keen insight into character; he was also a writer of undoubted dramatic talent. In spite of his leanings towards the stage, he did not entirely escape the influence of the declamation which was so common among modern writers.

July 25th, 1830. *G. Tell.* Pichald.

The critic complained that the right of representing tragedy was confined to two theatres, because the minor ones then took the themes, and made them the basis of vaudevilles and melodramas. Neither did he deem it advisable to take an old play from the *répertoire* of the theatre as it would soon be out-of-date; this view proved that the *Globe* was cognisant of the progress of the Tendency. This play failed because it was pure history without a tinge of imagination. Schiller had succeeded in Germany, but his system was not suited to the French stage; this fact also accounted for Pichald's failure.

Aug. 23rd, 1830. *Liberty of the Stage.*

The *Globe* speaks of the liberty of the stage, and the responsibilities which it involves. It was very necessary to prevent satire becoming too acrimonious, especially at a time when men's feelings were so easily roused. The strenuousness of the age was bound to find

expression on the stage. The *Globe* protested against the excesses committed in the name of Art, but, strange to say, it did not recognise the germs of a living literature in this new movement of society.

Aug. 30th, 1830. *Jeanne la folle*. Fontan.

This article deals with the oft-debated question of the position of literature at the time of the Revolution. In a peaceful age Art is pure because it follows its fancy; but during a period of political rivalry, it must give expression to the burning questions which agitate men's minds. The first alternative is the better of the two, but the *Globe* is still true to the principle of *la vérité*, since it urges the writer, in both cases, to follow the trend of society. The writer favours us with his views on criticism, "raconter fidèlement l'impression que produisent les ouvrages nouveaux, bien comprendre la situation des poètes, ne pas exiger d'eux qu'ils fassent de l'art pur, quand ils sont entraînés fatalement à faire de l'éloquence, insister d'autant plus sur la perfection de la forme qu'il y a nécessité de passer légèrement sur le prosaïsme du fond; telle est aujourd'hui, selon nous, la marche que doit suivre la critique." Poets were obliged to express the aspirations of the times in which they lived before they could lay claim to being individualistic. The editors of the *Globe*, as we have previously shewn, were becoming more prone to lose sight of true Art. There was, after all, a possibility of combining Art and politics, though the sphere of influence of the *Globe* was somewhat narrowed by its adherence to this point of view.

Jan. 24th, 1831. *Clara Gazul*. Mérimée.

Mérimée was regarded as the most individualistic author of his day. The *Globe* remarks that he intensified his personal inspiration by keeping it to himself for a

time, and then expressing it, not in lyric poetry, but in the characters of the drama. We cannot understand why the critic should draw such a sharp distinction between lyric poetry and the drama. A poet must needs be individualistic to be lyrical, and he can possess the same quality on the stage. The general aspect of individuality, which is the very essence of its existence, has been overlooked. The *Globe* does not credit Mérimée with the prevalent vagueness, nor does it attach him to any system, though he is an eminently modern poet. Speaking of Mérimée, it states, "En s'appliquant à des faits pour leur imprimer le cachet de son génie, il n'a jamais songé à les rapporter aux conceptions générales." These words are apt to be misleading, because they imply that the author can place the impress of his genius on a fact without touching the element of generality. This is impossible; the writer takes facts as he finds them in their general aspect, and is individualistic because he states them in his own peculiar way, or because he expresses his own personal impressions in a manner which is intelligible to all. Mérimée is regarded as an ideal writer because he adheres to no system. "Auprès des Lamartine, des Hugo, son originalité consiste à être le poète individuel le plus dégagé de sympathies catholiques, de mélancolie spiritualiste, et de fantaisie ondoyante." He is linked with the Tendency, but, after all, there are certain points of difference between them. We then conclude that the *Globe* does not acknowledge the existence of a Romantic School, but that it supposes the existence of a new movement whose different phases allowed plenty of scope for originality. This Tendency possessed certain general principles, but they must not be construed into the basis of a system. This principle, according to the *Globe*, consisted of the abandonment of the traditions of the past, and the realisation of an ideal in the future. The only way of attaining this ideal was to be true to one's aspirations, and to those of one's times. The *Globe* ex-

presses itself thus : " Est-ce à dire que l'auteur ait moins à faire que ces deux grands poètes pour ressembler à l'artiste de l'avenir ? Il en est même plus loin peut-être en ce sens qu'il est plus restreint ; mais ce qu'il faut reconnaître, c'est qu'il répond avec un à-propos rigoureux à la disposition et au goût de la société présente."

March 29th, 1831. *Hernani*. Hugo. C. Magnin.

The critic opens the article by stating that *Hernani* is the reverse of the old traditions in every particular ; in the first instance, the unity of action is destroyed. Hugo carries his love of antithesis very far, but this fault has the advantage of fixing the attention of the reader on the chief characters ; the disadvantage is the artificiality which results from placing these characters in a definite set of circumstances. He is congratulated on painting the character of a Spanish maiden in the person of *Doña Sol* ; this remark may well serve to refute the general impression that *Hernani* was a travesty of history. No doubt there were some anachronisms, but, taking it as a whole, it was a straightforward statement of fact. The theme of Love is treated in a new manner ; *Doña Sol* is an almost perfect representation of a woman ; she is not a meek *Juliette*, neither does she rave like the heroines of the Classical stage. The critic has gone out of his way to cavil at Hugo for imitating the Pseudo-Classical ways. He regards these two lines,

" Le bleu manteau des rois pourrait gêner tes pas ;
Le pourpre te va mieux ; le sang n'y paraît pas,"

as vain declamation. We have quoted them, because they seem to us to be a good example of a simple idea expressed in noble language. We must mention Hugo's use of figures ; the one characteristic feature of his style is symbolism. The critic remarks that both tragedy and comedy in France were bound down to the solemn

epic verse. Two objections are made to this proceeding; firstly, "c'est de porter le brisement du mètre jusque dans le chant"; secondly, "le rejet que font quelquefois les auteurs quand le sens du premier vers est complet ou paraît l'être." The first reason requires no comment; the second arises from Hugo's passion for *l'enjambement* even in cases where it was not required. The epic verse of the Classicists was too rigid; it had to be made more plastic to suit the characters in their different situations, and modern writers attempted this with tolerable success. This licence, as the critic seemed to think, was no fault of language, for Hugo was over-particular in this matter.

April 24th, 1831. *Médicis et Machiavel*. Pelissier.

Our attention is called to the prevalent practice of taking one type of character to represent all periods. The *Globe* does not agree with this view because it regards mankind as ever progressive. This Tendency which represents the individual, stands for progress. The only safeguard, according to the critic, is to study history, and gain a knowledge of the world. Modern authors are wrongly accused of misrepresenting the Middle Ages; the *Globe* now desired them to take the St Simonien view of things. We quote this example to shew the manner in which the new religion had impaired the critical faculties of the editors of the *Globe*. The Pseudo-Classicists regarded the individual as a type; this view fell short of the ideal of individualism because it lacked the general aspect.

June 30th, 1831. *Maréchale d'Ancre*. De Vigny.

This drama, according to the *Globe*, was a complete representation of a period of time, and, as such, comprised the tragical and the comical elements; it succeeded because it was based upon fact. De Vigny can be regarded as modern, because he introduced horrible details into the play. The *Globe* praised the Romanti-

cists when they were deserving, but it was never sparing in its criticism. It had an inherent hatred of systems as injurious to true Art. This distinction is neatly brought out, "comme conception romantique, c'est une des meilleures productions de l'école; mais son défaut, c'est précisément d'avoir été composé d'après une conception romantique." De Vigny desired to compose a historical drama; he studied the chronicles of the Middle Ages; he failed, according to the critic, because he abjured his own individuality to take up that of the period which he was describing. This view brings us back to our statement that the rôle of the author was to stamp his genius on a subject; unless he did so, he was no better than an annalist. The *Globe* has not much to say in favour of the so-called Romanticists, when it speaks of De Vigny as "le plus capable de sentir tout ce qui se trouve d'incomplet, de peu social, de peu vivant dans les théories littéraires de ses amis."

Aug. 15th, 1831. *Marion Delorme*. V. Hugo.

The critic complains that Hugo's friends had banded themselves together to ensure the success of the play—a proceeding which was certainly not conducive to the progress of true Art. We make no attempt to reconcile the character of *Marion Delorme* with history; the whole play is, to our mind, unnatural, because the antithesis of vice and purity in the heroine's character is quite impossible. Hugo has contrasted, but has not blended, *the beautiful* and *the grotesque*. *Didier* is a modern conception because he is so mystical. The critic suggests that he composed such plays to shew his antagonism to the Pseudo-Classicists; we would rather attribute their conception to the custom of the age. Though opposed to the unities of time and place, Hugo favoured the unity of action, because it was based upon reason. The critic does well to urge him to seek his inspiration in the present, but he can surely treat Middle Age themes and yet be modern.

CHAPTER IX.

THE *GLOBE* AND HISTORY.

Jan. 6th, 1825. *Manifesto.*

THE *Globe* places on record its ideal of history—“on a bien raison de dire qu'il faut étudier l'histoire dans ses sources; et nous devons beaucoup à ceux de nos savants qui, au lieu de se réserver, comme une langue secrète, la connaissance des monuments originaux, les livrent aux profanes.” History was not meant to be the pleasure of a few, nor the domain of any party. It was to be treated in such a manner that all men could understand it. This, like all other branches of literature, had its personal phase in that the general features could be understood by the individual. We can thus include the renaissance of history in the Tendency.

Jan. 11th, 1825. *Napoléon. Ségur. Ph.*

Ségur has offered us, according to the critic, a very faithful picture of the campaign because he has reproduced what he himself saw. Our view is that the historian should first be sure of his facts, and then introduce the amount of imagination necessary to produce a work of Art. For the purpose of this work, history must primarily be regarded from a literary, and not from a scientific point of view. This branch of study had, in

past years, been too much of a party weapon. The *Globe*, as a journal of modern ideals, was opposed to this proceeding: "c'est qu'il n'a pas abaissé l'histoire au rôle de l'éloge académique." It does not care for the gloss put on facts, thus reverting to the principle of *la vérité*. The unnaturalness of M. Ségur can be attributed to his excessive imagination; the faults of the young authors were the same in all branches of literature.

Jan. 13th, 1825. *Histoire de la Révolution Française.*
Thiers.

Some critics were of the opinion that modern authors were not capable of writing a history of the Revolution. The *Globe* replies that, as they had taken no part in the Revolution, they were impartial, and could see its effects in older persons. It also bears witness to the passion of the men of the 19th century for the principle of *la vérité*—a necessary condition of all historical research. Thiers was considered impartial *not after a system*, but as a historian. The secret of his success was his knowledge of the ways of the world; he put no gloss on facts, but faithfully reproduced them. He was individualistic, to our mind, because he was able to gauge exactly the opinions of his times. He has, in the first and second volumes of the work, introduced some imagination, but, as far as our knowledge of the history of the period goes, he has adhered to facts. We do not agree with the critic that these volumes are inferior to the others because they are History pure and simple. The *Globe* sets a high ideal before historians: "l'histoire n'est point un lieu commun de morale et de sensibilité; c'est l'adresse de l'écrivain de faire sortir de ses récits des leçons sans les donner." It also advises Thiers to pay attention to style without sacrificing the historical aim of his works.

May 7th, 1825. *Histoire des ducs de Bourgogne.*
Barante. A.

Barante is praised for describing the past in the light of the present. His principle was *scribitur ad narrandum*—a purely artistic conception. Without entering into any historical discussion, we would state that Barante was a theorist and an artist in history before the appearance of Thiers, and, in many ways, independent of him. We can make use of this fact to illustrate the independence of the authors of the Romantic Tendency in every branch of literature; these two authors possessed nothing in common save their modern inspiration.

June 11th, 1825. *Histoire de la Conquête de l'Angleterre.*
Thierry. Jouffroy.

The *Globe* states that every century interpreted History in a different manner; we must therefore consider the manner in which the critics dealt with this branch of literature. It admits the influence of the historian on History itself; this statement seems to us to be more than true of the 19th century, as it was a time of individual expression. Sismondi and Guizot are said to have stifled the old traditions by their search after truth. We are told that this work, which destroyed the whole fabric of history, was received without a murmur of disapproval; this strange phenomenon, in the opinion of the critic, connoted the existence of a state of doubt which always preceded the triumph of truth. The principle—*la littérature l'expression de la société*—was always paramount, according to this article, in a normal state of affairs, but we must remark that every age was bound to have prejudices which were never favourable to historical genius. The *Globe* has more than once called attention to the absence of fixed opinions at this period; it will suffice to recall the

mysticism of the 19th century writers to prove this statement. It also states that a period of this description was the *beau idéal* of History; we would add that this was not the only circumstance which contributed to the realisation of the historical ideal; the growth of scientific thought and analysis must be taken into consideration. This historical genius is regarded as general, but not particular; this view is not quite correct, because this genius was individualistic in that it represented the aspirations of the age. We have thus the union of the two features which are the necessary conditions of individualism. Thierry was an excellent painter, but no philosopher; he did not attempt to start from the hypothetical ideas of the 18th century, but he probed into the past, and considered it in every possible light; in a word, he arrived at a true estimate of the period. We are told that all men, except those enamoured of the old traditions, could derive pleasure from the perusal of this history; no finer testimony could be borne to the merit of any work. This consideration brings us once more to *l'unité d'intérêt*.

Jan. 19th, 1826. *Histoire de la Révolution Française*.
Thiers. Sainte-Beuve.

Sainte-Beuve states that, after reading this book, he could not have expected the events to turn out otherwise; this is an example of what is called *le fatalisme historique*; one event seems to be the natural conclusion of another. Thiers drew his own conclusions; the reader did the same, and thus evolved the philosophy of history. This is the ideal, but so many causes, unknown to the reader, come up that it is not practicable. The historian, according to the *Globe*, was to take the events which represented man in a natural state, and to draw his conclusions from these data. We think that too much was expected of the historian who, after all, could not possibly be acquainted with *all* the causes which went

to make up a certain effect. The view here expressed was based upon the principle of *la vérité*. Thiers painted the period of the Revolution in its true colours, and saved history from becoming a party weapon. His style is weak, but modern historians were so intent on making their study a reality that they paid no attention to this particular feature. His language, like that of most contemporary works, is flowery; we fully agree with the *Globe* that style enhances the value of a production. The *Globe* has nothing but praise for the passion for truth, but it severely criticises the particular faults of modern authors.

Feb. 4th, 1826. *Sismondi*. Letter from correspondent.

We are told that, whereas the ideal was to unearth traditions and embellish them with a more or less elegant style, Sismondi did research work, and enhanced the value of his labours by careful attention to style. The correspondent gives us the key to the situation when he states that Sismondi was a man of the 19th century. We would state that the historian had not only to understand his age, but also to express its ideals in his own way so as to be individualistic; the same feature seems to pervade all branches of modern literature. The canker of the criticism which was based upon a system, was felt in history as well as in other branches of literature, but matters were improving: "*l'esprit de système est tombé maintenant en discrédit.*" The *Globe* states that, though the past was open to the writers, history was not a matter of invention, but of logical sequence. It seems to forbid imagination, but, on closer examination, we find that such is not the case, as it lays stress on the union of fact and imagination. So much so that Sismondi is blamed for overstepping the limits of fact—a natural failing of the youthful authors. This is another proof that the *Globe* did not favour them as Romantic authors, but as worthy historians.

March 28th, 1826. *La Révolution Française*. Mignet.
Sainte-Beuve.

It seems almost impossible to regard modern historians as absolutely alike. Where was their bond of union? We think that the only connecting link was their disavowal of the old historical methods, and their treatment of facts in a scientific manner. With these exceptions, they all have their peculiarities; in a word, they are all individualistic. We see that the progress of History was analogous with that of the other branches of literature. We go further and link the commencement of this revival of History with that of the Tendency in general. Thierry had read the famous passage in the sixth book of *les Martyrs* of Chateaubriand where *les Francs sauvages* are so vividly described; this was the one incident which gave him a glimpse of what history should be. There were also many perplexing problems which men had to consider. They could only be solved on strictly scientific lines; this was perhaps the most important reason for the renaissance of historical study. Sainte-Beuve opens the article by linking Mignet with Montesquieu and Bossuet who were the nearest approach to what a scientific historian should be; he thus supports our view that the Tendency had its *précurseurs*. Mignet, according to the *Globe*, commiserated individuals, and then grouped them. He thus went from the particular to the general, and blended the two elements. Mignet then belongs to the Tendency because he is individualistic in the true sense of the word, but, in conjunction with Guizot, he differs from his peers in that he is more philosophical. The *Globe* acknowledges the diversity of talent among modern authors: "nous n'entendons exprimer ici aucune préférence, et bien plutôt, nous félicitons l'un et l'autre de cette éclatante diversité de mérites qu'ils portent dans le même sujet et jusque dans les mêmes opinions." Thiers leaves the reader, to a large extent, to draw his own conclusions, while Mignet

treats them as rigidly as a logical syllogism. The style is said to be original, and suited to the ideas; we can say that Mignet did not attempt to correct his faults of style because he thought that it would harm the swing of the narrative. It seems to us that more than one modern author has displayed this same weakness.

April 22nd, 1826. *Révolution en Angleterre.* Guizot.

The critic opens the article by stating that the whole of history had to be recast, because the older writers had no historical genius. They were not simple enough; this was due to the lack of individuality. The critic remarks that History must either be a simple statement of fact, or merely a cold scientific reasoning. He goes on to state that every fact has its particular existence, and that it must be linked with others before we can arrive at any conclusion; we have here a statement of the old principle of individualism. The *Globe* favours the standpoint of *scribitur ad narrandum*; we may trace this predilection to the hatred of partisan feeling. Guizot is modern because he has followed this individualistic bias. We are told that the pressing need of dealing scientifically with facts precluded Guizot from paying any attention to style; the *Globe* allows its regard for the principle of *la vérité* to give way to considerations of Art. The modern historian cannot be blamed for this failing; history had to be written to suit the needs of the time.

April 27th, 1826. *Les Barricades.* Unknown.
T. Duchâtel.

A young author who seemed to be an artist in the matter of imagination, derived great pleasure from reading a certain period; he desired to make others share this pleasure. He took up a narrative, and, with

the aid of his imagination, composed a really artistic work based upon fact—the very ideal of the *Globe*. If the *Globe* was satisfied with this work, we do not see why it almost always objected to the passion of modern writers for Middle Age subjects. It quotes the example of Guizot who, though treating a Middle Age theme, finds room for modern ideas. The *procédés* of all modern writers were pretty much the same, as they described the past in the light of the present.

Oct. 28th, 1826. *History and other Branches of Literature.*

The *Globe* always favoured works based on History, but it was blamed for thus directing the minds of the young people, for a number of inartistic compositions appeared in consequence. This may be regarded as a testimony to the widespread influence of the *Globe*. The past as described by Scott was, according to the critic, fantastic; but some of his local colourings were very truthful. Many writers copied these features, but, by so doing, they became inartistic. Scott himself followed the ideal, but his imitators did not study History; they made up for their lack of originality by the free use of their imagination and their recollections. The critic states that the work *les Barricades* (quoted above) is an almost perfect example of the union of fact and imagination, but we think that he has not dwelt sufficiently on the note of personal inspiration struck throughout the work. He thinks that the inroads made on historical subjects by other branches of literature have not been successful; we would state that original historical novels, like those of Scott and Hugo, were successful because of their just measure of truth and imagination; the other compositions failed because they were imitations of a personal inspiration.

Dec. 30th, 1826. *Les Caractères d'une Véritable Histoire.* Thierry.

Thierry gives his views on the position of History in France; they are of such interest that we shall quote the most striking without further comment: "Dans ce temps de passions politiques où il est si difficile lorsqu'on se sent quelque activité d'esprit, de se dérober à l'agitation générale, je crois avoir trouvé un moyen de repos dans l'étude sérieuse de l'histoire. Je me dis qu'à toutes les époques et dans tous les pays il s'est rencontré beaucoup d'hommes qui, dans une situation et avec des opinions différentes des miennes, ont ressenti le même besoin que moi. L'esprit d'indépendance est empreint dans notre histoire aussi fortement que dans celle d'aucun autre peuple ancien ou moderne. L'étude de nos antiquités m'a prouvé que nous n'avons pas d'histoire; la vraie histoire nationale est encore ensevelie dans la poussière des chroniques contemporaines. Dans ces récits, nous ne trouvons ni une instruction grave ni des leçons qui s'adressent à nous, ni cet intérêt de sympathie qui attache en général les hommes au sort de qui leur ressemble. Je ne doute pas que beaucoup de personnes ne commencent à sentir les vices de la méthode suivie par nos historiens modernes qui, s'imaginant que l'histoire était toute trouvée, s'en sont tenus, pour le fond, à ce qu'avait dit leur prédécesseur immédiat, cherchant seulement à le surpasser, comme écrivains, par l'éclat et la pureté de style. Je crois que les premiers qui oseront changer de route et remonter pour devenir historiens aux sources mêmes de l'histoire, trouveront le public disposé à les encourager et à les suivre. Mais le travail de rassembler en un seul corps de récit tous les détails épars ou inconnus sera long et difficile. Ce ne serait point assez d'être capable de cette admiration commune pour ce qu'on appelle les héros; il faudrait une plus large manière de sentir et de juger: l'amour des hommes comme hommes, abstraction faite de leur

renommée ou de leur situation sociale ; une sensibilité assez vive pour s'attacher à la destinée d'une nation tout entière, et la suivre à travers les siècles comme on suit les pas d'un ami dans une course périlleuse. Ce sentiment qui est l'âme de l'histoire, a manqué aux écrivains qui, jusqu'à ce jour, ont essayé de traiter la nôtre. Ne trouvant pas en eux-mêmes le principe qui devait rallier à un intérêt unique les innombrables parties du tableau qu'ils se proposaient d'offrir, ils en ont cherché le lien en dehors. Pour soutenir cet échafaudage et maintenir le fil de leurs récits, ils ont été contraints de fausser les faits de mille manières ; il est difficile d'en avoir retenu autre chose, en fait d'institutions et de mœurs, que le détail bien complet d'un état de maison royale."

May 12th, 1827. *Histoire de la Révolution Française.*
Thiers. Sainte-Beuve.

We shall not enter into a discussion of the facts, but only of the style of the book. The *Globe* links Thiers with the Tendency by stating that he possessed a picturesque style. He also seems to have possessed a fault of Lamartine—*la nonchalance*. Thiers was modern not only on account of his historical views, but also of his style. The critic pleads for individuality, and regards History as most favourable to its production: "En histoire, les faits étant du domaine de tous, l'historien, s'il veut que son œuvre soit durable, doit la marquer fortement comme un sceau ineffaçable"—we have here again the union of the particular and general to form the idea of individualism. The *Globe* was in favour of everything modern, "affirmer hardiment qu'aucune histoire ne mérite à plus juste titre la vogue contemporaine."

May 17th, 1827. *Vico's "Scienza"* by Michelet.
Jouffroy.

As Michelet was one of the most brilliant of modern historians, we would quote the critic's appreciation of him. "Vico a rencontré dans Michelet un esprit capable de l'entendre. Dans Vico, la pensée est tout, la forme rien; la difficulté était de le rendre intelligible. Michelet l'a heureusement surmontée en réduisant le texte, encombré de digressions diffuses, et en présentant, dans son Introduction, une exposition courte et claire du système développé dans le livre. Le traducteur de Vico est déjà, et restera toujours un excellent esprit."

Aug. 2nd, 1827. *Histoire de la Révolution en Angleterre*.
Guizot. Jouffroy.

Every true historian, according to the *Globe*, writes after his own manner. No definite rules can be laid down, as they would restrict talent, "les arts poétiques n'ont jamais fait ni un poète ni un historien. L'histoire doit varier selon ces principes variables." History must also express the aspirations of the age, "l'histoire est fille du siècle et de l'homme." Guizot is aptly described as a representative French historian; "on n'aperçoit dans Guizot aucune trace d'imitation ni de système. Il ne s'est ni rapetissé ni exhaussé, ni déplacé ni arrangé, pour écrire l'histoire; il l'a écrite avec sincérité et vérité, suivant pour toute théorie les inspirations de son jugement et de son goût. Il en est résulté qu'il s'est mis dans sa manière et que si elle n'a pas l'avantage de rappeler telle école ou tel auteur, elle a le mérite d'être une expression fidèle de l'homme et du siècle." These words sum up the position of the *Globe*, and it would be idle on our part to enlarge on them; we would however draw attention to the fact that the same ideas were held with regard to the other branches of literature. The critic calls attention to the

analytical spirit of the age especially in the realm of History; this gives us a clue to the position of the *Globe*. This spirit did not take any notice of style. The *Globe*, by regarding Guizot as individualistic, describes the age in which he lived. The historian, in spite of his analytical bias, shewed that he had opinions of his own; he was never partial, and thus understood the particular as well as the general phase of history. His style is simple because his sole aim was to prove certain facts; he only belonged to the period by reason of his impartiality, and strong independence in matters of opinion.

March 8th, 1828. Letter from correspondent.

The correspondent states in his letter that facts possess a truth which is only relative, and that their colour depends upon the point of view we take; i.e., we can extract more truth from one fact than from another. The *Globe* did not agree with this view because of its passion for *la vérité*; the writer however considered that imagination should have due place.

Feb. 11th, 1829. *Histoire des Gaulois*.
Amadée Thierry.

History had, according to the critic, come to be regarded as biography; this was a considerable advance on the old view. Historians were now attempting to discover the origin of the divisions of the different nations. May we not consider this as a step in the direction of individuality, as, in their treatment of the general, writers were bound to take the particular into consideration? The *Globe* blames Thierry for mingling Latin documents, foreign to the subject, with such a modern theme; it always objected to the union of the ancient and modern. The negligences of modern authors were condemned; it is interesting to note that the *Globe* makes this complaint of nearly all modern writers.

June 24th, 1831. *Histoire Universelle*. Michelet.

The *Globe*, now the organ of *la doctrine Saint-Simonienne*, deplores the dissolution of all beliefs, and the existence of scepticism, particularly that of Byron. We shall not discuss their view, but simply state that they regarded Michelet as a representative of his age and, therefore, purely individualistic. The *Globe* thus somewhat changed its position, as everything became subservient to the new religion. The absence of religious impressions or of individual inspiration connotes, according to the *Globe*, the absence of that bond of union with the outside world. It thus goes back to the manner in which Chateaubriand belonged to the Tendency, but still praises personal inspiration, though from a different standpoint. The critic rightly regards Michelet as an artist, and states that he was alive to the needs of the age. Michelet, according to the *Globe*, preaches the doctrine of *Man against Nature*, and thus brings no new light to bear upon History. The critic rightly questions his historical talent, but bears testimony to his poetic genius. We would state that this spirit of restlessness was a characteristic of the age, but we cannot follow the *Globe* in this discussion, as it judges from the point of view of Saint-Simon. This vagueness was rightly attributed to the lack of settled beliefs.

CHAPTER X.

CONCLUSION.

THE editors of the *Globe* almost invariably claimed that they were independent of the so-called Romantic School (*vide* Ch. II.). Most littérateurs stated that it was a Romantic organ, but, generally speaking, they mentioned the bare fact without any comment. We shall now proceed to quote the opinions of a few representative critics.

“Aux cadres de convention où les classiques impénitents emprisonnent invariablement tous les sujets, il oppose tout simplement l'histoire. La chronique en main, il montre au public la stérilité de leurs créations étroites. Ce n'est pas un grossier réalisme que la critique préconise. Il veut que la tragédie retrouve l'idéal à force de vérité et d'imagination. Tout ce qui s'intéresse à la littérature en France, était attentif à de pareilles leçons.” (Demogeot, *Hist. de la Litt. Fran.* Ch. XLVII.)

“Fondé en 1824, il doit, quoiqu'en ait dit Sainte-Beuve, être rangé parmi les journaux romantiques. Tout au moins, il fut beaucoup plus romantique qu'autre chose, malgré son dessein d'être éclectique en littérature. Il voulait surtout être un journal littéraire sérieux, vraiment informe et indépendant, tant des coteries que des librairies. Nous voyons le *Globe* admettre le mélange du tragique et du comique dans le drame, attaquer très vigoureusement les trois unités. Le dieu littéraire du *Globe* était Lamartine.” (Julleuille, *Litt. Fr.* Vol. VII. pp. 699—672.)

“Les questions de liberté littéraire étaient à l'ordre du jour ; on leva le drapeau de l'indépendance contre la littérature de l'Empire. Ce journal venait à son heure. Une génération ardente, cherchant sa voie à côté de la politique, voulait imprimer au 19^{ième} siècle une physiologie originale, un caractère distinctif. Tout ce mouvement intellectuel, toutes ces forces vives d'une jeunesse impatiente avaient la liberté pour point de ralliement. Vu de près, cet ensemble d'efforts et de talents montrait des origines diverses, des aspirations variées ; mais la résultante était un énergique essor, une lutte puissante.” (Larousse, *Dictionnaire sur “Romantique.”*)

“En littérature, le goût de la nouveauté, de la variété, de la liberté, de la vérité, même sous les formes les plus étrangères, c'était là le drapeau des rédacteurs du *Globe*. Le *Globe*, d'abord exclusivement littéraire, adopta avec beaucoup de chaleur, les principes de la nouvelle école qui aspirait à rajeunir notre littérature en rompant avec le troupeau servile des imitateurs.” (Hatin, *Histoire de la Presse en France*, Vol. III. p. 500.)

“Dans la grande querelle qui s'agitait entre les classiques et les romantiques, le *Globe* se prononçait volontiers en faveur de ces derniers, toutefois sans esprit exclusif ni parti pris.” (Vapereau, *Dictionnaire*.)

“Le *Globe* fut fondé en 1824 : il était libéral ; il accueillit pourtant les idées littéraires des romantiques.” (Lanson, *Hist. de la Litt. Franc.* p. 926.)

“Les théories romantiques ont été souvent exposées dans des articles de journaux tels que le *Globe*.” (Doumic, *Hist. de la Litt. Franc.* pp. 516, 517.) We can then state that most people regarded the *Globe* as a Romantic organ.

“S'il y avait alors dissidence marquée, division au *Globe*, en quelque matière, cette dissidence portait, le dirai-je, sur la question dite romantique. L'école romantique des poètes ne put jamais faire irruption au *Globe* et le gagner comme organe à elle ; mais elle y avait des alliés et des intelligences. Leroux, Magnin, et celui

qui écrit ces lignes, penchaient plus ou moins du côté novateur en poésie. Dubois, Duvergier, De Rémusat, et l'ensemble de la rédaction étaient en méfiance, quoi que généralement bienveillants. Tous ces petits mouvements intérieurs se dessinèrent avec feu à l'occasion du drame de *Hernani* qui eut pour résultat d'augmenter la bienveillance. Mais, hélas ! rapprochement littéraire, union politique, tout cela manqua bientôt." (Sainte-Beuve, *Port. Litt.* I. p. 318.)

Sainte-Beuve thus dissents from the general view. He expresses this same opinion in yet another statement :— "il semble aujourd'hui, à ouïr certaines gens, que le *Globe* n'eut pour but que de faire arriver plus commodément les doctrinaires, grands et petits, après avoir passé six longues années à s'encenser les uns les autres."

The Globe is nothing but a progressive paper, in sympathy with the aspirations of the youth of France. It practically ignores the Pseudo-Classicists, but, at the same time, it is not a Romantic organ. It denounces the tenacity with which rules and traditions are kept, and praises purity of form. It finds fault with the exuberance of youth which expresses itself in flowery language, and extols the desire for freedom in the realm of letters, and lays great stress on truth and naturalness. It has not the bitterness of an avowed party organ, but deals out criticism to both sides with an unsparing hand. It has, moreover, no fixed policy, as the word was then understood, but deals with every work on its merits. The Globe has no allies and no direct communication with either the Romanticists or the Pseudo-Classicists. In a word, the Globe was entirely independent. This opinion differs from that of Sainte-Beuve; he did not regard the *Globe* as an out-and-out Romantic organ, but stated that it was in direct communication with modern authors. We prefer to affirm its complete independence.

